

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF THE  
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.  
APRIL, 1878.

---

ARTICLE I.

A QUESTION TOUCHING THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

The question which it is proposed to discuss, in this article, is by no means one of vital importance. It affects no fundamental truth in doctrine or morals. Yet it has been given a fictitious importance, and has assumed a shape, that seems to demand more than a passing notice.

At the recent Lutheran Diet, held in Philadelphia December 27th, 28th, 1877, Dr. Conrad, in his paper on "*the Characteristics of the Augsburg Confession*," made the following statement :

"From the time the Confession was first sent to Luther, on the 11th of May, until the time of its presentation to the Emperor, on the 25th of June, it underwent constant verbal changes, and appeared in different forms of completeness in successive stages of its composition. And in this improved form it was sent to Luther between the 22d of May and the 2d of June, and again secured his unqualified approval."

The correctness of this statement was called in question, and the authority for it challenged. In the proceedings of the Diet, as published in the *Lutheran & Missionary*, the following appeared :

"Rev. Dr. Brown challenged Dr. Conrad to produce historical evidence."  
Vol. VIII. No. 2.

ical proof that the Confession was twice submitted to Luther before its publication (presentation). Dr. Conrad cited his authorities, and was sustained by Prof. Krauth."

Dr. Conrad gives his authority for his statement, in a note appended to his paper as printed in the authorized publication of the proceedings of the Diet. From this note it appears he relies on the authority of "*The Conservative Reformation*," by Dr. Krauth; quoting his statements from pages 227 to 233. Dr. Krauth also, in a tolerably extended note to the discussion on Dr. Conrad's paper, gives what he considers the proof of the statement as vouched for by Dr. Conrad and himself. This proof is the simple reiteration of what he had formerly published in the *Conservative Reformation*. There is no new evidence adduced.

We have thus brought distinctly before us the question of the reliability of these statements, made by Drs. Conrad and Krauth, for a second and third sending of the Confession to Luther, and his "*unqualified approval*" of it as thus sent, before it was submitted to the Diet: and this is the question which, so far as the evidence they furnish is concerned, it is proposed to discuss and, if possible, settle in this article. The burden of proof rests with them. It is not our duty to prove a negative. They have made and repeated the affirmation, and have pointed us to their authorities. It is with these alone that we have at present to do. If they have any other or better evidence for their statements it will be time enough to consider it when it is presented. For the present, they rest their case on the evidence they have submitted, and ask for a verdict in their favor.

It will be observed that Dr. Conrad depends entirely on the authority of the *Conservative Reformation*, by Dr. Krauth, to support his statement. Now, however learned and critical Dr. Krauth may be, he is not a very good personal witness for what took place more than three hundred years ago, and in this instance, we think, will not prove a very safe guide in examining the testimony of those whose authority must be decisive.

When the *Conservative Reformation* was published, seven

years ago, we pointed out what seemed to us very plain cases of perversion of testimony, and special pleading, leading to the most unwarranted conclusions. We ventured to call Dr. Conrad's attention to what we regarded as the utterly unreliable character of that evidence, and cautioned him against its use as authority to support his statement. We find no fault with him, however, that he has chosen to follow the *Conservative Reformation*, rather than to give any weight to our poor judgment in this matter. But we must be excused from believing without better evidence, and for presuming now to show how reliable, or rather utterly unreliable, the statement in question, as well as the evidence on which it rests, really is; and for telling Dr. Conrad plainly, that for once, at least, he has been sadly misled.

Did we not feel certain, beyond a doubt, in what we propose to say, we should hesitate to put ourselves in opposition to such authorities as Drs. Krauth and Conrad. Dr. Krauth has professedly made the Augsburg Confession a life study. He has translated and edited, what purports to be, a very critical edition of the Confession. It has been commended for "the labor, scholarly care, and valuable learning which have been bestowed upon it." The *Conservative Reformation*, which treats at length of the Augsburg Confession, professes such "completeness as to render it unnecessary to refer to other works while reading it." This suggestion Dr. Conrad seems to have followed with becoming reverence and submission without even taking the trouble to verify the authorities cited. He may have been encouraged to this, by the assurance that the *Conservative Reformation* would be accepted as infallible authority, and whose accuracy it would be the height of presumption to question. With manifest reference to the strictures of this REVIEW on the character of some of the statements and arguments, in the *Conservative Reformation*, our esteemed friend, Prof. H. E. Jacobs, in an appreciative and flattering review of the work says:

"In connection with this chapter, [that on the Augsburg Confession] we have carefully studied in the original the entire correspondence referred to, and can bear witness to the accuracy of every statement in the discussion."

We felt disposed, at the time, to call attention to the issue thus made, and to some very plain facts in the case, but have allowed the matter to rest until this new discussion has brought the subject to the surface again.

After such an array, it may seem a little hazardous to call in question statements put forth with so much assurance and sustained by such authorities. But truth is mightier than any man, and plain facts are more convincing than learned opinions.

We come now to the simple facts in the case. Has Dr. Conrad furnished any reliable evidence that the Augsburg Confession "*was sent to Luther between the 22d of May and the 2d of June,*" and "*that it again secured his unqualified approval?*" Or has Dr. Krauth furnished any reliable evidence of its being sent, as he maintains, not only a second, but "*for a third time before it was delivered?*"

This is a simple question of fact, and which must be determined by the evidence in the case. We would prefer to follow the chronological order, and examine the evidence adduced as it is thus presented, but as we happen to know that Dr. Conrad relies especially on what *purports to be* a letter written by Luther to Melancthon June 3d, 1530, we will dispose of it first: and that may prepare our readers for a more careful examination of the other testimony.

In response to the call for the authority for his statement, Dr. Conrad says: "*We accordingly refer to \* \* Luther's letter to Melancthon of June 3d, as quoted by Dr. Krauth in his Conservative Reformation.*" He adds still further on in his note: "*On the 3d of June, Luther wrote to Melancthon: 'I yesterday (June 2d) re-read your Apology entire, with care, and it pleases me exceedingly.'*" For authority he refers again to the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 234. And the *Conservative Reformation* does contain this statement, referring to De Wette, No. 1,243; Buddeus, No. 137; and Walch xvi. 1,082, to support it. Precisely the same statement had been made by Dr. Krauth, in his edition of the Augsburg Confession, four years earlier, and the same authorities cited. This seems to be very conclusive, and we know with what confi-



dence and enthusiasm Dr. Conrad has appealed to it as triumphantly establishing his position. Luther says: "*I yesterday re-read your Apology entire, etc.*" This was of course an entirely different reading from that of the 15th of May, when he returned it after his first reading.

But there is just one difficulty in the way of this testimony of Drs. Krauth and Conrad. It is however a rather serious difficulty—LUTHER WROTE NO SUCH LETTER AS THEY PRETEND ON THE 3D OF JUNE, and there is not the shadow of a shadow of authority for their statement. This may seem strong language, but is not an open question, or one about which there is or can be any dispute. Not a single authority cited by Drs. Krauth and Conrad pretends any thing of the kind; but all the authorities are agreed in placing the letter in question on the 3d of July. Luther did write a letter, containing the language quoted, but instead of being written on the 3d of June—22 days before the presentation of the Confession at the Diet it was in reality written on the 3d of JULY—8 days after the presentation; and after, as we know and will have occasion to show, the Confession had been sent to him *subsequent to the presentation*, for his examination and judgment.

Of course we do not ask Drs. Krauth and Conrad to receive this on our mere assertion. But we ask them to examine any or all of the authorities which they profess to cite, and to produce any one that gives the least authority for placing this letter of Luther on the 3d of June, instead of the 3d of July. That our readers, who have not access to these authorities, may be under no doubt on this point, we desire to repeat, that there is and can be no question about the date of this letter—the evidence external and internal leaves no room for any doubt, and there can be none. The date of this letter is as well settled at that of the presentation of the Confession itself. The citing it as written on the 3d of June is a plain, indisputable case of error, which admits of no debate or cavil. It is needless to cite the authorities, for they all agree, and it has never been a point of dispute.

It will be readily understood, that a letter written eight days after the Diet, and just one month later than Drs.

Krauth and Conrad give it, cannot be of any value in supporting their opinion. When Luther says: "I yesterday re-read your Apology," instead of interpolating June 2d, as is done, it should be July 2d, and July 2d does not come "between the 22d of May and the 2d of June." So this letter of Luther, to which the date June 3d has been conveniently fixed, will serve no purpose in proving Luther's approval of the Confession *prior* to its presentation, after a second or third sending. The "*unqualified approval*" which is thus claimed for the 3d of June, turns out to have been given *after* the Diet, on the 3d of July.

It is not our business to offer any explanation of this very palpable mistake, and almost ludicrous use made of it to prove a pet theory. The most charitable supposition would be, that it was originally a blunder such as almost any one, who is not very careful, might make. But as it was thus published in the edition of the Augsburg Confession, in 1868, repeated in the *Conservative Reformation*, in 1872, and now used in a grand Lutheran Diet in the city of Philadelphia, in 1877, and published in the proceedings, after the statement in part based on it had been publicly challenged, if it is not a 'blunder worse than a crime,' it is one, whose continued repetition admits of no apology or defence. We have determined, at least, to do what we can to stop its repetition, if we cannot correct the blunders of the past. It may be too much to expect that those who have been thus active in giving currency to this blunder to support a lame conclusion, will show the same zeal in correcting the impression thus falsely made by it; but it is not too much to ask that this blunder, of years' standing, shall not continue to be repeated in books and other publications, which claim the confidence of unsuspecting readers.

Before leaving this point, it may be proper to state that Melancthon wrote to Luther on the 26th of June, the day after the presentation of the Confession, and says: *Cæsari est exhibita defensio nostra, quam tibi mitto legendam*, "Our Confession has been presented to the Emperor, which I send to

you that you may read.”\* On the very next day, he writes to Luther again and says: *Nostra Confessio est exhibitā Imperatori, exemplum etiam tibi misimus, quod apud te retinebis, ne emanet in publicum.* “Our Confession has been presented to the Emperor, a copy also I have sent to you, which you will retain, &c.”† On the same day writing to Vitus Theodorus, who was with Luther at Coburg, he begs that he will let him know Luther’s opinion about it. *Sed de ea re Doctoris iudicium mihi rescribe.* It is of this copy of the Confession, sent to Luther June 26th, after the presentation to the Emperor, that Luther writes, July 3d—“I yesterday re-read your Apology entire with care, and it pleases me exceedingly.”

As there is no question, and never has been, about the dates of these letters, this, we think, will settle Drs. Krauth and Conrad’s letter of the *3d of June*. There is no such letter of that date, and the citing of it so often, and now again in the printed proceedings of the Diet, to prove their point, we leave them to explain as best they can. We know, and our readers now may know, that this part of the evidence is not simply of no value, it is no evidence at all, as such a letter *of that date* has no existence.

We come now to the second part of their evidences: and this is about as reliable as this letter with the fictitious date of June 3d. It has indeed the advantage that what there is of it, is real. The argument is based on what Melancthon himself says about the Confession. Dr. Krauth, in his note in the proceedings of the Diet, p. 238, says: “The evidence relied upon [for a *third* sending] is Melancthon’s own statement;” and then refers to the same authorities as given in the *Conservative Reformation*. He simply repeats and emphasizes certain points—and strangely enough, as we shall show, some of the points emphasized with *italics* are not at all in Melancthon’s statement. We quote Melancthon’s own words. *Praesentibus Principibus et aliis gubernatoribus et*

---

\*Corpus Reformatorum, vol. II., No. 741.

†Corpus Reformatorum, vol. II., No. 745.

concionatoribus disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis. Missa est deinde et Luthero tota forma Confessionis, quae Principibus scripsit, se hanc Confessionem et legisse et probare.

Dr. Krauth, followed by Dr. Conrad, argues that the sending of the Confession referred to in this statement of Melancthon, and its approval by Luther, are "wholly distinct from Luther's indorsement of the Confession as sent May 11th, for that was not the '*tota forma*,' but relatively unfinished; that had not been discussed before princes, officials, and preachers, for they were not yet at Augsburg."

A real feat is exhibited in the way of translating and commenting on this language of Melancthon. It is divided into several distinct sections, and the material part thus translated. "It was discussed and determined upon in regular course sentence by sentence. The complete form of the Confession was subsequently sent to Luther, who wrote to the Princes, that he had read the Confession and approved it."

It is by no means certain that *de singulis sententiis* means "sentence by sentence." It may mean, and probably does, concerning each opinion, or subject, or point. It is quite certain, however, and does not require a very profound knowledge of Latin to know thus much, that *disputatum est* cannot have as its direct subject *Confessio*, and hence that Melancthon does not say "it" [the Confession] was discussed and determined upon." The verb is impersonal, and the meaning simply is 'there was discussion in order on each opinion or point,' or as Dr. K. translates, "sentence by sentence." Where the "*and determined upon*" comes from, we are not informed, and are at a loss to conjecture. When it is repeated, as it is, the words are italicised thus: "It was *discussed* and *determined upon* etc." Then we have it, italics and additions, "It was sent *after the discussion and determination of it* in regular order, article by article as it came, and sentence by sentence before and by princes, officials and theologians." Diet p. 240. If it is meant, after the fashion of our English Bibles to indicate by italics, that the words have been interpolated by the translator, and are no part of Melancthon's

text, very well; but we suspect this is not the design, nor will the reader so understand it. We have thus interpolated into Melancthon's statement, "*determined upon, article by article as it came . . . by,*" without the shadow of authority in the original. It is however important to the author's purpose, and these six words of Melancthon—*disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis*—are made to do good service in the cause. But even after putting into the translation of Melancthon's statement twice as much as it really contains, and emphasizing the spurious additions, it will not sustain the argument or warrant the conclusion.

It will be noticed that the argument hinges on two points—"the princes, officials, and preachers not yet being present at Augsburg, May 11th," and the Confession not yet being "*tota forma.*" Dr. Krauth says: "Up to May 11th, the Elector (with his suite) was the only one of the Princes at Augsburg. On the 12th, the Landgrave of Hesse came; on the 15th the Nurembergers. Not until after May 22d did that conference and discussion take place, of which Melancthon speaks." This he reiterates in his note in the discussion on Dr. Conrad's paper: "John of Saxony, up to May 11th (with his suite) was the only one of the princes at Augsburg."

Now, to the superficial or unsuspecting reader, this looks quite conclusive. The discussion was "in the presence of the princes and other officials, and of the preachers," and yet "up to May 11th, the Elector (with his suite) was the only one of the Princes at Augsburg." How then could the discussion have been in their presence, if not yet there? This is Dr. Krauth's inquiry which is to confound opposition.

But that very innocent looking "*with his suite,*" in parenthesis to hide its real significance, will disclose facts which utterly destroy that part of the argument. That "*suite*" of the Elector, that is made so small as to need a parenthesis to hold it, really included quite a number of "the princes, and other officials, and of the preachers." Let us see. It included a majority of the princes who actually signed the Confession, well on to a hundred of the nobility, with the most

distinguished theologians and officials. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, in an article in the *Evangelical Review*, vol. x., p. 488, says: "The Elector was attended by an imposing retinue, consisting of NUMEROUS PRINCES and noblemen." Waleh, Intro. in Lib. Sym. pp. 166, 167, says: "The Elector, John of Saxony, took with him his son, John Frederick, Francis Duke of Luneburg, Wolfgang Prince of Anhalt, and not to enumerate the counts, barons and other nobles, his theologians, Martin Luther, George Spalatin, Justus Jonas, Philip Melancthon, and John Agricola, the last named being in the train of Albert, Count of Mansfield." Luther was left at Coburg. Coelestinus, giving an account of the entrance into Augsburg, after mentioning by name the leading Princes as already enumerated, adds *et aliis nobilibus viris ac equitibus centum et sexaginta*, etc. As the "*suite*" of the Elector, mentioned with this indifferent air, and shut up in a parenthesis, actually contained a majority of the Princes who signed the Confession, with noblemen, chancellors, theologians, and other officials, it is very strange that the effort should be made to create the impression that "*Princes, officials and preachers were not yet at Augsburg.*" The fallacy of this part of the argument is too transparent to need any further exposure. There were "Princes and other officials and preachers" at Augsburg, when Melancthon wrote his letter of the 11th of May, and they had been there for ten days. The subject of the Confession to be presented had occupied their attention. This we know on the most reliable authority.

So much for no princes being at Augsburg, at that date, except the Elector.

The other point on which the argument is based—the expression "*tota forma*," which is made to mean "complete," "finished"—yields as little support to the conclusion sought to be drawn from it. Indeed, we know beyond any dispute, that if it is to be interpreted in the sense of "*finished*," that is completed, as Dr. Krauth argues, it was not thus finished on the 22d of May, nor on the 3d of June, nor at any of the dates named, prior to the very time of its presentation. Melancthon went on improving and *finishing* to the very last.

Dr. Conrad's date, "between the 22d of May and the 2d of June," would find it still unfinished. Taking that letter of Melancthon, May 22d, and admitting all that is claimed about its being sent, and received, and answered—of which more by and by—yet it would not be the finished Confession that Dr. Krauth insists on having sent. There is no agreement in this respect between Dr. Krauth and Dr. Conrad. One of them claims a second sending, the other a third.

But *tota forma* does not refer so much to the finish or completeness of the work, as the entirety or totality of the document, its plan or structure. We are sorry to have to differ so often from Dr. Krauth on mere questions of the meaning of words, or translation of simple Latin, but we should like to know where he found any such meaning as *finished* for "tota." We venture to say that "*finished*" or "*completed*," in the sense assigned to *tota*, is quite foreign to the meaning of that word. *Totus* expresses the *whole*, in opposition to a *part*, and not "*finished*" in opposition to "*unfinished*." And this agrees with the facts in the case. Müller, in his introduction to the Symbolical Books, calls attention to the fact, that the Elector, in sending the Confession to Luther on the 11th of May, refers to the "*Controverted Articles*," and that these were included. So it was not simply the *doctrinal articles*—*articulos fidei*—but the controverted articles also, or articles concerning which there was dissension, in a word, the *tota forma* of which Melancthon is speaking, and which he says was sent to Luther. Thus the facts and the words employed harmonize, and confirm each other.

But we have authority which ought to have weight in this argument—that of Dr. Krauth himself, and that of Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, for applying the terms "*finished*" and "*complete*" to the Augsburg Confession as sent to Luther on the 11th of May. In the *Conservative Reformation*, when reviewing Dr. Shedd's *History of Doctrine*, on this very point, the author says, p. 336: "This Confession, *when finished*, was sent by the Elector to Luther, by whom, without a solitary change, or suggestion of a change, it was approved, May 15th, one month previous to the entrance of the Emperor



into Augsburg." Now let the reader bear in mind, that "this Confession," which the author of the *Conservative Reformation* tells us in this place, "WHEN FINISHED was sent by the Elector to Luther, by whom it was approved, May 15th" is the identical Confession, which he and Dr. Conrad argue was not the "*tota forma*," *not finished*, and hence must have some other and subsequent sending to answer the phraseology employed by Melancthon. At one time it is declared that it was *finished* on the 15th of May, at another that it was *not finished*. How is this? Dr. Krauth is opposed to himself. He uses the fact one way when replying to Dr. Shedd, he and Dr. Conrad use it another way in the Lutheran Diet. We must leave them to reconcile their own palpable contradictions about that *tota forma* of the Confession, sent to Luther May 11th, and meanwhile they must excuse us if we refuse to give our endorsement to an argument which they have used to establish directly opposite and contradictory conclusions.

Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, in the article already quoted, *Evangelical Review*, vol. x., p. 486, says: "With the well-known answer of Luther, May 15th, which is given by all the writers before us, he returns the document, *which was the Augsburg Confession in its complete state*, stamped with the seal of his approbation." The italics are his own. Dr. Schaeffer says not a word about another sending and "*unqualified approval*," after this on the 15th of May. Two things may be learned from this statement of Dr. Schaeffer. First, that he understands the Confession sent on the 11th of May to be the *tota forma*, or whole Confession, and, secondly, that this approval of Luther, May 15th, is the only one that he alleges previous to its presentation to the Emperor. This he regards as *the* approval which Luther gave it. Contrary to the argument attempted to be drawn from Melancthon's language, we have now shown, we trust beyond any reasonable dispute, that "princes, officials and preachers" were at Augsburg on and before the 11th of May, and that the whole form, *tota forma*, of the Confession was sent to Luther at that time. This destroys the argument based upon this language to prove a



second or third sending, and leaves it without the support thus claimed.

We have now examined another of the proofs of this second sending according to Dr. Conrad, third according to Dr. Krauth, and are quite willing to leave the evidence they adduce to every intelligent and candid reader. It is such, Dr. Krauth says, as "will sweep away all necessity for any further discussion on this point." He seems to think the proof in the case settles the question. But so far from convincing us, we shall be greatly surprised, if our readers capable of sifting and weighing testimony, can find in this anything deserving the name of proof. The argument is unsupported by a single fact drawn from a fair interpretation of Melancthon's language, and is contradicted by Drs. Krauth and Schæffer's testimony, as well as by that of others whose authority might readily be adduced. If any are convinced by this proof, surely it must be because they are satisfied with "trifles light as air."

The last argument remains to be considered. This is based on Melancthon's letter to Luther, May 22d. We are free to admit that this letter gives a better show of plausibility to a second sending of the Confession, or rather a part of it, not the *tota forma*, to Luther than either of the other arguments. But it is not such proof as would be accepted before any careful impartial tribunal, of the whole Confession being actually sent to Luther, and it does not afford a particle of evidence of its having thus received his "unqualified approval," or any other kind of approval a second or third time. Let us examine carefully and impartially this last proof, and see what it amounts to—whether it is sufficient to warrant their conclusion or not.

It is a fact which is not disputed that Melancthon did write a letter, addressed to Luther, and that the date assigned is May 22d. In that letter he does express the wish that Luther would run over "*the articles of faith*:" *Vellem percurisses articulos fidei, in quibus si nihil putaveris esse vitii, relinqua utenque tractabimus.* He says that he is changing many things in the Confession daily. Now it is admitted that Me-

lanchthon wrote such a letter, and expressed such a desire. But this is all, absolutely all, that can be proved. There is no satisfactory proof that Luther ever received the letter, and so far as we know, no pretence of a reply to it.

We care nothing at all about the theories in reference to the destination of this letter. We care as little for Dr. Krauth's theory as for that of Rückert, which he treats with so much scorn and contempt. It is a fact that there is doubt about Luther's ever receiving this letter written May 22d. Were there any positive or clear proof of its reception, this would have made theories about it not only needless but impossible, which, as is well known, is not the case. Some have supposed that it miscarried, or that it was purposely withheld from Luther: others treat the latter supposition as a base calumny upon the parties interested. Still the fact remains—there is uncertainty as to this letter having ever reached Luther; and there is more than uncertainty about any reply. This latter is not even pretended, and hence there is not a particle of evidence, in this letter of Melanchthon, of Luther's reading the Confession a second time and giving it his "unqualified approval." We have no reply of any kind whatever from Luther to this letter of Melanchthon.

In the other cases of sending the Confession, as May 11th, and June 26th, there is distinct mention of the fact. Letters accompanied the sending. We know the particulars, and we have the acknowledgment of its reception, and the reply after reading. Nothing of the kind in this case. Everything is uncertain. In the letter itself Melanchthon says nothing about the Confession being sent, as in the other instances. There is simply a wish expressed, and no more.

The letters passing between Augsburg and Coburg were quite frequent. They have been carefully preserved. Dr. Krauth says: "We have about seventy letters of Luther, written to Augsburg during the Diet, and we know of thirty-nine written by Luther to Melanchthon in the five months of correspondence, during the Diet, or connected with it in the time preceding." Among all these letters of Luther where is the one that tells us anything about the reception,

or reading, or approval of the Confession at this sending? We should be glad to have presented such a letter, and it would settle the question, but unfortunately no such letter or evidence of any kind has been produced.

The simple writing of such a letter on the 22d of May by Melancthon, cannot of course be accepted as evidence that it was received by Luther, much less that he read the Confession again, and gave it his "unqualified approval." If Dr. Conrad had, during the Diet in Philadelphia, written a letter to Dr. Krauth in West Philadelphia, expressing a wish that he would run over his (Dr. C.'s) speech, but had received no reply, and had no evidence that Dr. Krauth ever received his letter, it would be assuming a good deal to say, that Dr. Krauth had read the speech and returned it with his "*unqualified approval*." It would be a more reasonable supposition that his letter had not been received, or that for some reason it elicited no reply. This is about the case with Melancthon's letter to Luther, May 22d. There is no reply of Luther to that letter, and how can it be cited to show his approval? Letters sometimes miscarry now, or fail to receive answers, and the same may have been the case three hundred and fifty years ago.

We know that bitter and grievous complaints were made by Luther of his not receiving letters from Augsburg, and of his being left in ignorance of what was going on. This is one of the well known facts in the history of the Diet. We could furnish several very characteristic letters illustrating and confirming this point—Luther's anger at not hearing from Melancthon, and Melancthon's pains to appease him. May it not after all be true that Luther never received this letter of the 22d of May?

But Dr. Krauth says, 'Luther did receive it, and that on June 1st he quotes largely from it.' If it were so that Luther quoted largely from it, this would be proof that he must have received it. We are sorry to be compelled again to call in question the accuracy of such a statement. We have this letter of Luther before us. It is the letter of Luther to Jacob Probst, Licentiate of Theology, Minister of the Word in

Bremen, June 1st. We have read it and compared it with the letter of Melancthon. There is not only nothing in the letter that is given as quotation, but there is no mention of Melancthon's letter or reference to anything he has written. He does tell him that 'he has now the state of things about as they are at Augsburg—that Philip (Melancthon) Jonas, Spalatin, Agricola, are with the prince at Augsburg.' But nothing that professes to be or bears the character of a quotation.

The allegation that he "quotes largely from it" is based on certain verbal coincidences in the two letters, and which are given in the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 230. But we can present the very same or similar coincidences in other letters written from Augsburg to different persons about the same time. They are easily explained by the simple fact that they relate to things well known, and were repeated over and over.

But all the discussion about this letter being received is of little account; for if it was received, and Luther did what Melancthon desired, it was only a *part* of the Confession, and not the whole—simply the "*articulos fidei*"—he wished run over, and this is no "unqualified approval" of the *whole Confession* a second time.

Of the proofs offered by Drs. Conrad and Krauth, the *first* is based on a letter with a false date, and so is utterly worthless; the *second* depends on the denial of a plain fact, and a mistranslation of Melancthon's Latin: the *third* has no solid basis to support it, and, if it had, proves nothing to the point. The whole is not worth the paper on which it is printed.

We are open to conviction on this subject. If Drs. Conrad and Krauth have any trust-worthy evidence to offer, the pages of the REVIEW are freely open to them to present it. We have no interest to serve in this case but that of the truth—and if there is any evidence of Luther's repeated reading and approval of the Confession before its presentation, we shall be glad to have it furnished. But we still wait for the proof.

## ARTICLE II.

## NEUROLOGY AND THE HUMAN SOUL.

By Prof. W. H. WYNN, Ph. D., State Agricultural College, Ames, Ia.

It is the tendency of all materialistic systems to contract the true measure of the soul, and, in certain cases, aside from its acknowledged value in some large aggregate of mind, to reduce its personality almost to a blank. Mr. Tyndall, in an address recently delivered at the Midland Institute, in the city of Birmingham, England, sagely distributed all the powers of the soul into the physical and physico-chemical forces of which the body is composed, and gently waved the old-time conception of a self-conscious ego to the realm of myth. "Adequate reflection," he says, "shows that the hypothesis of a free human soul, instead of introducing light into our minds, increases our darkness." We may entertain the conception in accommodation to the unscientific habits of the times, but at last we must come to know that it is a poet's dream. So understood he will not object. "If you are content to make your soul a poetic rendering of a phenomenon which refuses the yoke of ordinary mechanical laws, I, for one, would not object to this exercise of ideality." And then, at last, in what assumes to be the latest discoveries of the physiological school, we have Mr. G. H. Lewes, their most sanguine expounder, in his *Physical Basis of Mind*, putting down both soul and body as mere abstractions covering concrete experiences, which science can apprehend only as the tremor of the nerves, but which we are required, by some sort of verbal legerdemain, to translate into the operations of the mind. It is time, therefore, that we should reassure ourselves of the true measure and inherent greatness of the soul, and ascertain, if the data be on hand, wherein the broadest generalizations of biology are destined to fail.

## THE SEA WITHIN.

Max Müller traces our English word *soul* to an old Gothic original, meaning the *sea*, and infers that our Teutonic ancestors must have "conceived of the soul as a sea within, heaving up and down with every breath, and reflecting heaven and earth on the mirror of the deep." However this may be, there is a pre-eminent beauty and propriety in representing the soul under the figure of a sea. The larger portion of the earth's surface is given up to the dominion of the waters, and to one standing on the beach, the ocean, stretching far away into the dim solitudes of the distance, becomes a symbol of immensity scarcely less impressive than the sky in which it is lost. For the time being, the dry land shrinks in comparison, and the lofty mountains are a very little thing. In like manner are we always impressed with the vastness of the soul, when we look pensively within, and see our own spiritual horizons dissolving forever into the bosom of the Infinite, or over the history of mind, rolling up its unmeasured accumulations, in science, and art, and civilization, and song. Then the sea has its tides and currents, pouring incessantly through all latitudes of the watery expanse, the booming billows meanwhile leaping to the moon, and then breaking away in receding eddies, round all continents and islands, from pole to pole. So there are vast undercurrents of emotion and sweeping tides of passion, which indicate what fathomless depths there are to the human spirit, and how frail these fleshly barriers are, when the inner forces are lashed into a tempest.

Perhaps, as our myth-loving ancestors represented the sky as God, and the sea seemed to them to come pouring forth from its illimitable azure, and rolling back again into it, it would be an easy transfer, a kind of natural metaphor, to figure the soul of man as in like manner related to God. Even to the cultured vision the sea is, next to the sky, the most impressive symbol of immensity that is anywhere to be seen, the

—— "glorious mirror, where the Almighty's form  
Glasses itself in tempests; in all time,

Calm or convulsed, in breeze, or gale, or storm,  
Iceing the pole, or in the torrid clime  
Dark-heaving ;—boundless, endless, and sublime,  
The image of Eternity—the throne  
Of the invisible"—

so there is something closely analogous to this in the far-reaching, illimitable stretches of our inner being, which renders thought or mind as nearly akin to the Deity, as the ancients conceived the sea to be to the sky.

#### CONSCIOUS SUPERIORITY TO NATURE.

Let us get some impregnable position in the acknowledged vastness of the spiritual powers of the soul. We cannot, indeed, measure the mental energies, as we would measure the mighty forces and stupendous magnitudes of the physical world, yet we need not hesitate to say that the mind of man is immeasurably vaster than all these forces and magnitudes combined. In a sense unquestionably true it may be said, that every man carries within himself a measure of being, inconceivably greater than that which is concentrated in all the suns and all the stars with which this physical universe is teeming. And that this may not be set aside as the empty language of compliment, in which human vanity is so eager to be flattered, let us adduce a few propositions that will make it clear.

First, then, however vast these physical forces may be, the soul of man is destined to have them in subjection, either as objects of knowledge, or as instruments of use. Now, beyond all question, it requires more being to subdue, than to be subdued. The mind of man is evidently making the conquest of this world. And it is a remarkable fact that all those modern theories of human nature, that make man only a link in the chain of cause and effect, and insist that his mental powers are but the complex co-ordination of the cosmic forces we see about us, also urge that the chief end of man is to subdue nature to his behest. But how can he subdue nature, unless he be greater than it? Indeed there is nothing so settled in human experience, as that man can subdue nature, or let nature subdue him; and it is this peculiar

element in his being that we call the will, which gives him a glory above the stars, and confounds and stultifies every system that would resolve his mental powers within the mere generalizations of biology. The great and insuperable mystery which no formula of biology can solve is, that man *knows himself*, and knows that he is *free*, and will never more thoroughly *know that he knows*, or be induced to believe that he does not know, by any researches he may make into the structure of the brain. His consciousness must be finally his appeal and there is nothing of which human nature is so invariably and so essentially conscious, as its superiority to the natural world.

Science, here, seems to have fallen into the singular paradox of pronouncing the consciousness of freedom an illusion of the unscientific mind, and yet by no means assenting that it shall have no place in the economy of our beliefs. She would not cast it out. It is too vitally concerned in all the upward movements of the race. She aims, however, to apply to it the generalizations of biology, and make the mind superior to the other natural forces, only as complex and highly differentiated forces are superior to those more elementary and uncombined. Two are stronger than one, and ten thousand are infinitely stronger than two. So says biology. The forces co-ordinated in the brain differ not in kind, but in degree, from those which we know so familiarly in the physical world around us. They are more powerful than heat, or light, or electricity, or the vital energies, or the automatic combinations in the human frame, simply because they are more complex, and not because of any power of self-adjustment they may be thought to possess. They are more powerful, but not more free; and this is the correction which Science would interpolate in the popular belief.

Now the insuperable objection to this is, that the forces in the brain have the capacity of being stronger or weaker just as they choose; that is to say, they are not compelled to exercise their inherent power over the forces of nature, as they would be, if they were simply a higher development of those forces. We have this from a source that can no more be



questioned, than can the best established facts in the anatomy of the brain. There is a point in the recesses of rational being, to which the law of necessity does not apply; provided, of course, that consciousness has any right in the field; and no complication of neural processes can ever be made the equivalent of that which consciousness uniformly pronounces the self-determining power of the human soul. And so it must be held that the will of man, in its last analysis, sets off his spiritual being as differing in kind from all those forces with which physics and biology are conversant; and that it is a fatal short-coming of philosophy to seek the true measure of the soul in such unpromising fields.

#### THE CREATIVE ENERGY, WHAT IS THAT?

Again, the soul of man is a *creative* energy, and this is absolutely inconceivable in a power that is wholly under the dominion of cause and effect. Take genius, the spirit of discovery, the inventive faculty, any display of that creative power, whereby the human race moves onward and upward in civilization and culture, and, relaxing which, it will go back again into ages of the densest superstition and gloom—how could this upward *nîsus* of the soul be set down in any category of nature's forces! What, for example, does genius do when it surprises and overpowers us with the marvels of its creations? A Michael Angelo, a Beethoven, a Newton, a Shakespeare, what do these minds do, that so lifts them above their fellows, and so powerfully impresses the world with the exceeding grandeur and vastness of the soul? The answer to this will indicate specifically the insurmountable obstacle to every possible biological solution of the mind. Newton does, on a large scale, that which every mind, even of the lowest grade, is every day doing in an elementary way; and, on a small scale relatively, that which God himself is always doing in creating and maintaining the worlds, to wit, putting together elements and conceptions in such juxtaposition as they could not of themselves assume. That is creating. That is initiating a new development in nature;

but all minds are doing this ; and that is specifically the insoluble mystery of the mind.

Take an illustration. Astronomers for many long ages were satisfied with gazing upon the stars with the naked eye. Then, in some way we cannot recover from the past, the art of making glass was discovered. Further on, as the laws of light and vision were studied, lenses were invented ; and the mirror, known to men from the earliest dawn of history, was made to serve important purposes in elementary optics. By and by, in the opening of the seventeenth century, one Lippersheim, a Dutch astronomer, after long brooding over the matter in the silence of his laboratory, conceived the idea of putting together the object mirror and the eye lens, and immediately the telescope was born. It had, indeed, to pass on to the hands of Galileo, and Newton, and Herschel, before the great, complex, and powerful instrument we now have could be completed ; but, neither for Lippersheim nor Herschel, was the mental process essentially different from that whereby the first lens was invented. In the one case, as in the other, it was the operation of the creative power inherent in man, in the exercise of which he brings together elements, which, otherwise, must forever remain apart. All minds are, to a limited extent, creative, and genius towers above the common herd only in its faculty for wider and more intuitive generalizations, and its greater executive capacity in bringing these out into realized use. But whether in genius or the common mind, this is the conscious endowment of the soul which our materialistic methods cannot grasp.

DR. MAUDESLEY SWAYS TO AND FRO.

Dr. Maudesley, in his exhaustive attempt to reduce the whole spiritual fabric to physiological formula, evidently feels the force of this omnipresent and confounding puzzle, and affirms and wavers, and wavers and affirms, almost in the same breath, as if so vast a mystery were at last to be stormed by some sort of word-stratagem, that would dismantle the fort without a fight. He says unqualifiedly : "Instead

of the mind being as assumed, a wondrous entity, the independent source of power and self-sufficient cause of causes, an honest observation proves *incontestably* that it is the most dependent of all natural forces. It is the highest development of force, and to its existence all the lower natural forces are indispensably prerequisite.\* And then further on: "Without doubt the will is the highest force in nature, the last consummate blossom of all her marvelous efforts."† Then: "The highest action of the will is \* \* \* truly *creative*, for in it is initiated a new development of nature; \* \* \* If we ask whence comes the impulse that displays itself in this upward *nîsus*, we can only answer *lamely*, that it comes from the same unfathomable source as the impulse that inspires or moves organic growth throughout nature." "Incontestably" and "lamely" are words of vastly different import, and yet they are used in different connections with reference to exactly the same thing. Shall he incontestably or lamely assert, and with what degree of confidence shall we believe, that mind is but the highest development of that "impulse that inspires or moves organic growth throughout nature?"

Then, moreover, how can we reconcile the declaration, that the highest act of the will is truly creative, in the sense that it initiates a new development of nature, with the other assertion, that the mind is the most dependent of all nature's forces, and cannot therefore be a source of power? To create is to originate, and that which is bound up in a rigid order of sequence cannot do other than flow with the stream. However much we must respect the scientific attainments, and intellectual superiority of Dr. Maudesley, it is nevertheless true, that this and that in his reasonings cannot be put together.

#### THE GREETING OF THE SPIRIT, "WHAT IS THAT?"

But again, obviously, the powers of the mind are not limited to the brain. It is in the very nature of thought, that

\*Dr. Maudesley, "Physiol. and Pathol. of Mind," p. 67.

†Ibid., pp., 188 189.

it takes things in at a distance, and feeds upon the future as well as the past. And how is this done, or what is there in neural processes that can ever be an adequate explanation? From the days of Heraclitus down to the present time, the simple problem of bridging the chasm between mind and matter, has taxed the genius and learning of the ages to the utmost, and the points at issue seem to be as far off from adjustment now as they were on the day when they were first suggested. Empedocles thought that an efflux (*ἀπορροή*) was emitted from the surface of sensible objects, which penetrated the pores of the body, and, mingling with the blood, gave us that subtle compound we call the soul. Then came Democritus with his theory of *εἰδωλον*, which is but the same sensible efflux, or image, this time reaching the soul through the channel of the senses. Aristotle's *τό εἶδος* is substantially the same thing, the effluent image of the external object impinging upon the organ of sense, and pictured there as the representative of the thing from which it came. I do not see the book before me, but a filmy image has floated from it, and found its way through the senses to my intelligent soul. In this shape, the theory was transmitted to the Schoolmen, and, through them, on to the very borders of our own time, with only, now and then, a reaction in favor of the self-activity of the mind, in imitation of Plato, when he made the eager spirit go out through the portal of the eyes, and gather up the images, and bring them in.

Down even to the days of Descartes, or more properly Reid and Kant, this theory of sense-perception prevailed. Under the destructive criticism of the great Scotch philosopher it was completely exploded, but the system of Common Sense left nothing in its stead. It is remarkable that, from that day to this, notwithstanding the stupendous labors of Reid and Kant, and Hamilton, and John Stuart Mill, and Bain, and Spencer, and Lewes, and all the great intellects that are now at work on this problem, there has never been propounded an adequate or satisfactory explanation of the common act of perception. We have now no settled *rationale* of how the

mind takes note of the external world. No doubt all agree that:

"What sees is mind, what hears is mind,  
All things else are deaf and blind "

—but how does the mind see, how does it hear? This is a question upon which, in our own day, scarcely any two are agreed.

The mystery lies in the nature of thought. What is it, and how is it related to the organ in which it dwells? It is perfectly manifest that the physiological school is just as amenable to this mystery, as were the spiritualistic systems which they affect to ignore; and that the rigidity of their methods must keep them always farther away from a solution. Suppose Mr. Lewes should succeed in proving intellect to be a property of the brain, the most stupendous task is yet before him, to tell the world distinctly what the intellect is. What is that subtle power that runs so nimbly over all things, finding its way through ocean depths, and through the heart of the everlasting hills? What is that in the brain that is capable of mounting the empyrean, and roaming at will among the countless hosts of suns and stars, that float like baubles on the fields of space,—gauging their distances, and determining their buoyancy on the ethereal sea? What is this that can follow the backward current of the years to the awful silences of primeval solitudes, and read in the ripple of receding oceans the unfolding history of the great planet which gave it birth; or, forward to the issues and destinies which the future keeps locked up in its embrace? It is a property of the brain, is it?—but how much wider than the brain is the sphere of its operations! All this vast realm of being, of which it is a part, is its to know and enjoy; and the wider realm of truth, with which this physical universe is not commensurate, is the tenting-ground over which it marches from conquering to conquest.

"TO BE, OR NOT TO BE, THAT IS THE QUESTION."

This leads, naturally, to the deeper consideration of the vastness of the soul's being. Recurring again to our myth—  
Vol. VIII. No. 2.

ological figure, the sea is vast, the sky is vast, but vaster yet is that ocean of being from which the souls of men are wafted to this nether world. The poet Wordsworth was gifted with almost prophetic insight into this portion of our nature, and in his Ode to Immortality, has given it a more condensed and powerful expression in words, than is elsewhere found in our language. Long may one pause on each line and figure of that remarkable poem, and still find an Orphic fulness of suggestion on themes too lofty for logic to touch. Truer than Science are these divinings of the poet, because they pour a flood of light upon a class of truths, from which Science is forever debarred. There are times of elevated consciousness for every one of us, "momentary gleams," when we have flashes of insight into the mystery of being, which no most plodding research could ever attain :

"Hence in a season of calm weather,  
Though inland far we be,  
Our souls have sight of that immortal sea,  
Which brought us hither ;  
Can in a moment travel thither,  
And see the children sport upon the shore,  
And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore."

When the word *being* is pronounced, it is no empty, meaningless, shadowy term we are using, under which to cover some blank, or illusive conception which our ignorance or our imbecility has conjured. Men look up into the azure concave above them, and, when the eye will reach no further, they conceive the limit to be a crystalline floor of blue ; and for ages on ages all cosmological notions, and astronomical science, were built up on this illusion of the eye. There is no sky, and the word is used only in accommodation to the feebleness of our visual sense. On, and on, we must go, if we are on wing through space, and never find a spot beyond which we would not discover an infinitely vaster expanse than that we left behind. On, and on, forever, no end ! no end ! So, in the opinion of some, we have like barren intelligences, and deceptive words, in the imagined higher region of human aspiration and thought. *Being* is one of these,

and all those so-called higher verities, with which poetry and religion have to deal. As it was the office of science to take away the sky, and build up a true system of Astronomy on the actual immensity lying before it, so science will reduce this great matter of *being*, from the solid entity it is supposed to be, to the blank abysses of the Unknowable—in deference to the prejudices of men, spelling that word always with a capital U—and thus dismiss it practically from a place in human thought. The task, however, turns out to be a larger one than the great champions had conceived; already their first enthusiasm has died away, and the higher ideas remain undisturbed, like mountain ranges after the clearing of a storm, with their peaks lying serenely in the sky.

#### HEGEL AND THE MATERIALISTS.

It is noticeable how completely such systems must "cut the thread of history behind them." All the sublime speculations of the past, that proceeded upon the hypothesis of a spiritual entity called the soul, from Plato down, embracing the miraculous labors of the German metaphysicians right upon the heels of our own time, embracing Kant, whose labors produced an epoch in mind, analogous to that produced in politics by the French Revolution—all must be consigned to the "dead past" of Comte's metaphysical era, with scarcely *residuum* enough to fertilize the new fields, on which altogether new seed is to be cast. What matters it that vast systems were built up on this thought of *being*, we have now discovered that it was all moonshine and a dream, and the systems themselves have been rolled away like immense mountains of fog.

In the early part of the present century, there flourished in Germany a genius in philosophy, who, for depth of penetration, and grand, massive, almost miraculous, power of generalization in the phenomena of mind, probably never had his equal in ancient or modern times. It is no over-estimate of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel to say, that, in pure speculative capacity and vastness of comprehension, not even Aristotle or Kant could in any wise approach him,

although the final results of his labors are by no means so far-reaching or permanent as theirs. Now this man exerted all the power of his genius on the thought of *being*, *absolute being*, obviously an element in the consciousness of every one of us. Finally, he identified thought with being, and gave us that maxim which the world will not soon let perish, *that the real is the rational and the rational the real*. His theory of the identity of mind and matter in a substratum of absolute being, is a pantheism not unlike that of the great Spinoza, and, as such, not being in accord with the consciousness of the race, was inevitably fated to pass away. But *being* and *thought* were the two tremendous facts at the basis of his system, and if we are to have a *monism* in philosophy, how much better a monism of being, than a monism of neurological throbs!

Now imagine a materialist of our day, looking over a library of Hegelian literature consisting of several hundred volumes, and then turning contemptuously away to declare, that it is all an enormous waste of intellect on what, from beginning to end, is nothing but a figment of the brain. Prof. Draper has said as much. In his *Intellectual Development of Europe*, he boasts that he has made no mention of modern researches into the nature and attributes of the human mind, because all such researches have been totally barren of results. They have ignored anatomy, and were, therefore fundamentally false. He asks: "Of the great authors who have thus succeeded one another in ephemeral celebrity, how many made themselves acquainted with the structure of the human brain? Doubtless some have been so unfortunate as never to see one. Yet that wonderful organ was the basis of all their speculations. In voluntarily isolating themselves from every solid fact which might serve to be a landmark to them, they may be truly said to have sailed on a shoreless sea from which the fog never lifts."\* This is a grave charge, that Kant, and Hegel, and Sir William Hamilton, and all that have studied consciousness deeply, and made it a tribunal of appeal, were

---

\*Draper's, "Intel. Devel. of Eur." p. 578 et seq.



voluntarily isolating themselves from every solid fact, and sailing on a sea of fog.

But now let us ask, what more "solid fact" is there in all the range of man's knowledge than that of *being*, and what amount of scrutiny into the anatomy of the brain will throw the least particle of life on it? "I am;" "the world exists;" we act habitually on these postulates all the days of our lives; and we shall never be persuaded, by any amount of "honest observation," or speculative ingenuity, that we are walking in shadows, or conveniently courting the illusions of a dream. For me, and for all men, and all things, *being* is by far the most fundamental and "solid fact" which it is possible for the intellect to note, because substratum for, and inclusive of every conceivable phenomenon whether of matter or mind. It cannot be fully comprehended, we grant, but it lies broadly and deeply in our consciousness, and cannot be ignored. What forbids doing what we can with it, especially as, inseparably blended with it, is the larger consideration of the Supreme Being, the all pervasive Life, in which everything subsists. If my inquiries are to be confined to the anatomy of the brain, I shall not only have no answer on themes like this, but very likely the themes themselves shall be set aside, as having no rightful claim on the attention of man. What has the anatomy of the brain to say on all those deeper matters, which involve the moral freedom of the finite spirit in its relation to the Infinite? There is nothing in nerve-structure that is not fixed and invariable; nothing, that is, that is not strictly traceable to the inflexible order of conditioning causes and necessary sequence; and, therefore, a psychology resting on this physical basis will inevitably carry the law of necessity up into the region of the spirit, if, indeed, it find any such region into which to carry the law. For the most part the region of spirit virtually disappears; the old-fashioned *dualism* is wholly abandoned, or only so far retained as to signify the separate conceptions of bioplasm and force. The *me*, and the *not me* are sunk into the bottomless sea of negation, and nothing but the neural tremors are left. Every effort to grasp

anything deeper than phenomena, and these the grosser observations of the senses, is promptly condemned as transcending the legitimate range of human inquiry; and all high matters pertaining to God, and the finite personality, human freedom and destiny, are consigned to nescience, or labeled Theology, and flung to the dogs. Nevertheless these facts are of such infinite moment, and certify themselves so clearly to consciousness, that it is impossible to think of them as hushed, simply because they cannot be found in the anatomy of the brain.

QUEST OF BEING—FALSE REVERENCE.

For a moment let us consider how the mind must work on the fact of being necessarily involved in every word we use. "I am;" "the world exists"—if not intuitive, at least, with Hegel, we shall find that, on penetrating the concentric cycles of our consciousness, we must finally come to the great "I AM, the vast, shoreless, ocean of Being, "the immortal sea that brought us hither;" and, when fully launched there, no question of anatomy will embarrass our search. Thus: I am, and the world exists on which I live. Then there are other worlds, innumerable and effulgent, that sweep on forever through the fields of space. Now conceive of all these worlds as somehow ceasing to be, what then would remain behind? Let the scientist answer. He has inferentially satisfied himself of the existence of a luminiferous ether, diffused through all space, which, condensing in certain quarters, has become the nebulous flocculi out of which the worlds have leaped into being. Now let these worlds disappear, and, there would be left only the eternal silences, the infinite solitudes, the *tohu va bohu* of the abysses of ether. We are at liberty to carry our abstractions farther, since this is confessedly the material out of which the worlds were made. Let the ether be annihilated in thought, and we are fairly launched on that shoreless ocean of Being, that vast all-pervasive Life of lives, which is back of immensity, and is the spiritual expanse out of which our grosser *aurae* took their rise. All matter being destroyed, Being as left, unless, indeed, the word itself is a

mere verbal abstraction, an empty logical *copula*, good only for tying together a bundle of phenomena, and useless when the bundle is loose.

At this last sad negation all our materialistic systems must inevitably arrive. Being sinks into an abstraction, and the Supreme Being disappears in a myth. They will doubtless always have something awful in reserve, some auroral glare to spring up from the dim regions of nothingness, or at best to fling a baleful gloaming round the abysses of force, but thought and purpose, as we know them, will not have their habitation there, and if one should bow in the attitude of worship, he would be obviously indulging a superstition or a trick. With Mr. Huxley the subject is approached in silence; and Mr. Tyndall puts his hands on his forehead, and bows prostrate before a mystery he cannot solve. We should always think charitably of the motives of men, especially when the solemnities of worship are in anywise involved. There is hallowed ground there, and ere we intrude, we are softly admonished that we must take the shoes from off our feet. But when men have practically annulled the great central idea in which all genuine worship must inhere, and then put on the air of devotion in the presence of that which is not, it is difficult to reckon on their silence and prostration as in any sense sincere. Men do not honestly worship the inane. To call *being* a word, not, indeed, the Eternal Word of God, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, but a mere expulsion of articulate breath, a verbal conventionality in the machinery of thought, with no answering reality in all the universe that can be lawfully set down as the thing it means, and then to profess reverence for such a word, and, get up a ritual for it, is a kind of *fetichism* known only to our modern times.

No! as Mr. Spencer has unwittingly admitted, the Unknowable, about which he has elsewhere uncompromisingly claimed that nothing can be predicated, is nevertheless a Power—"a Power of which humanity is but a small and fugitive product,—a Power which was in the course of ever-changing manifestations before humanity was, and will con-

tinue through other manifestations when humanity has ceased to be,"\* why did he not add, a Power akin to that which has its residence in the brain, intelligent and free?

MR. G. H. LEWES—HIS DISCOVERY IN MONISM.

And now comes Mr. Lewes, with a resolute purpose to remedy the weak spots in Mr. Spencer's system. Great expectations were aroused by the promise of what he was to do, but now, alas! when we have scaled the Pisgah of his system, no goodly prospect comes to view. He has simply let down the philosophy of the mind into the grossness of a *monism*, that has no call for the deliverances of consciousness, except in so far as those deliverances shall perfectly coalesce with the teachings of his neurological science. He appeals to consciousness. "Consciousness says distinctly "I am soul," "I am body," but it does not say "I am two things," nor does the fact of a radical distinction imply more than a contrast of aspects, such as that of convex and concave. The curve has at every point this contrast of convex and concave, and yet it is the identical line throughout. A mental process is, at every point, contrasted with a physical process assumed to be its correlate, and this contrast demands equivalent expression in the terms of each."†

Thus, in this "two-fold aspect" theory, in a convex and concave way, Mr. Lewes would retain the two sides of our nature, the same sentient experiences being apprehended objectively as matter, and subjectively as mind. "Mind and matter, object and subject, are abstractions from sentient experiences. We know them as abstractions, and know the concrete experiences from which they are abstracted."‡ There is no *noumenon*, no self, no substratum either of body or mind, in which those concrete experiences inhere; we only know that they are mental or physical processes, according as they are apprehended, "now under the modes of feeling classified as objective or physical, now under the modes clas-

\*Spencer's "Study of Sociology," p. 311.

†Lewes' "Physical Basis of Mind," p. 377.

‡Ibid. p. 386.

sified as subjective or mental." "Let the example chosen be a logical process as the mental aspect, and a neural process as its physical correlate. The particular proposition may be viewed logically, as a grouping of experiences, or physiologically, as a grouping of neural tremors. Here we have a two-fold aspect of one and the same reality; and these different aspects are expressed in different terms."\* But what is the underlying reality? Did it ever occur to Mr. Lewes to make this inquiry; or, occurring to him, did it not flash upon his mind that this was after all the only thing to be ascertained? Elsewhere he says: "The real is alternately the one and the other,"—then of course there is no stable real underlying the two sets of experiences, and it is an unpardonable solecism to speak of "a two-fold aspect of one and the same reality." Where is the reality? Is it the neural tremor, or the mental process; and if alternately one or the other, then what becomes of the two-fold aspect of one and the same reality?

Mr. Lewes is very explicit in laying down the postulate that: "All existence as known to us is the felt;" and we distinctly feel two classes of experiences, which we discriminate as mental or physical processes, according as they are subjectively or objectively apprehended. But who are *we* that feel these experiences? Did it ever occur to Mr. Lewes that this is specifically the problem to be solved? One may pursue neurological researches on the one hand, and mental processes on the other, in parallel lines forever, and gain not one ray of light on the problem proposed to be solved, viz. the relation of thought to the brain, or, as Mr. Lewes will have it, the identity of mental processes with the tremor of the nerves. It is interesting to know that we have two sets of experiences, and that they may be studied separately, but Mr. Lewes volunteered to show us how these two sets of experiences inhered in our subject. What now must be our disappointment when at last we are given to know that there is no underlying reality, no subject, no person by whom

---

\* Lewes' "Physical Basis of Mind," p. 386.

these experiences are felt? To say that feeling, in itself, is the ultimatum of our knowledge, is to charge a word with a degree of significance it cannot carry; for, beyond all question, experiences cannot be felt unless there be some one to feel. But has not Mr. Lewes labored everywhere, and with a surprising wealth of induction, to show that sensibility or, viewed subjectively, sentience, is the universal property of the nervous system? Ah! then it is the nerves that feel, and our subjective translation of these nervous affections into terms of mind was a species of juggling, into which we were betrayed, for the purpose of easing in upon us the repulsive proposition "that matter can think."

#### THE VOLUNTARY POWERS GO DOWN.

As might have been expected, all man's voluntary agency goes down under these neurological speculations of Mr. Lewes. For how is freedom or self-determination, in any shape whatever to be found by the most careful and scrutinizing study of the habits of the nerves? It is the boast of Mr. Lewes that he has recovered himself from the mechanical automatism of Mr. Huxley, but then his organic automatism, so far as it bears on the free personality of man, is not one whit better. It is totally subversive of a fact of consciousness as large, and as tremendously significant, as all the facts of physiology put together; and the presumption is, that the unfortunate conflict has arisen from the effort to apply the grosser formulas to problems they will not solve.

But hear Mr. Lewes: "There is no real and essential distinction between voluntary and involuntary actions. They are all determined by feeling. It is convenient for common purposes to designate some actions as voluntary; but this is merely a convenience; no psychological or physiological insight is gained by it; an analysis of the process discloses no element in a voluntary action, which is not to be found in an involuntary action,—except in the origin and degree of stimulation." Again: "All actions are reflex, all are the operations of a mechanism, all are sentient, because the mechanism has sen-

sibility as its vital property."\* Then again, speaking of *will-ing* to avoid a blow, for example, he says: "The man acts thus because he is so organized that a particular neural process is the stimulus of a particular central discharge; and he became thus organized through a long series of anterior adjustments responding to stimuli, each adjustment being the activity of the vital organism."†

It will not do to swoop down on such philosophy as this with the cry of fatalism, or other such hard names, without having carefully examined the scientific ground on which it is assumed to rest. Without doubt, if it is a genuine deliverance of science that we are automata, and not in any sense free, personal, self-determining agents in the world, we should at once relinquish all "theological bias," and welcome the teaching, without foreboding the overthrow of social order, or the decline of religion in its train. We are reminded that truth is able to take care of itself. If science says authoritatively: "All actions are reflex;" "There is no real and essential distinction between voluntary and involuntary actions"—in other words, with Mr. Hæckel: "The will is never free," why, we need not torment ourselves on the possible collapse of human responsibility, and the coming on of a fearful moral night that will blot out the day. Science is to be trusted, and no one can be more confident of the future than he who will follow submissively in her lead. But the revolt against such doctrine is so universal and instinctive, because of the indefeasible prerogative of consciousness to be held as a factor in all such matters, that we cannot refrain from pronouncing the oracles we hear to be either deceptive or premature.

No one can help admiring the resources of Mr. Lewes, the patience and heroic devotion he exhibits in the tedious detail of experiment and induction, his intelligent grasp of the stupendous biological discoveries that are crowning our own time, and withal his power of generalization, though in a hopeless attempt. The nervous system seems a field pre-

---

\*Ibid., pp. 422, 423.

†Ibid., p. 448.

eminently his own. But, then, alas! the high promise which his new theory of vital automatism aroused, has been kept to our ear, but broken to our hope. Almost before it is formulated it is seen a thing that ought to be eschewed. It wants the prestige of a confident paternity. The new discovery in monism, which was to exempt it from the insuperable objections to all kindred systems in the past, is timidly, hesitatingly, periphrastically, and vaguely announced, and at last the great discoverer himself seems almost to abandon it as it struggles into life. What shall we make of his speculations, and with what tone of authority can they be promulgated, when installed with the following remarkable confession: "When we reflect how completely the modern views of the nervous system, and of the physiological, pathological, and psychological, explanations based on these views, are dominated by the current notions of the nerve-cell, it is of the last importance that we should fairly face the fact, that, at present, our knowledge even of the structure of the nerve-cell is extremely imperfect; and our knowledge of the part it plays—its anatomical relations, and its functional relations—is little more than guess-work."\* A frank acknowledgment, but strangely inconsistent with the confident and imperious tone in which the conclusions of this school are generally announced! The truth is Mr. Lewes has seen, as all others have seen, that Mr. Spencer's method of the molecular study of the brain was too jejune to yield any fresh contribution to the science of the mind, because the vital organism was swallowed up in the all-devouring mechanism of the scheme; and so he pushed forward his neurological speculations, for the purpose of making the vital organism reveal what physics and chemistry would not disclose. But the abiding difficulty is to study the vital organism in a vital way. The work for the most part has to be done on dead or dying nervous tissue, and against the obscuring effect of clumsy preparation. "So great and manifold" says Mr. Lewes "are the difficulties of the search, that, although hun-

---

\*Ibid. pp. 269, 270.



dreds of patient observers have, during the last forty years, been incessantly occupied with the elementary structure of the nervous system, very little has been finally established. Indeed we may still repeat Lotze's sarcasm, that microscopic theories have an average of five years duration."

Against this barrier all materialistic systems must chafe and beat their wings in vain. It is a lesson which the scientific men of our century must sooner or later learn, that the functional activity of the brain, in relation to thought can never be fully determined, except through consciousness co-ordinating the most exhaustive physiological search; that the living here must supplement the dead; that the direct study of the movement of that organ when alive cannot be done by anatomical methods at all; that for the living laws of its working, not simply "the total consensus of all the functions" is required, but the total consensus as apprehended in consciousness, and that, therefore, consciousness may supply a class of living facts that neurology cannot know. They must at last see, that, if there is a collision between the teachings of neurology and the universal and irrepressible instincts of the soul, it is because of the dead man, tied to the shoulders of the strong living one, when he would rise up and equip himself for the race.

QUAE NOCENT DOCENT.

We arrive at the conclusion, that every effort to resolve the mystery of the human soul, by means of physics or physiology, is fated to fail, because it is in the nature of these methods to antagonize the freedom of the will. If we are to quit our old metaphysics, and take up some form of automatism, whether it be the mechanical system of Spencer, Huxley and Tyndall, or the less frigid formulas of the great neurological school, of which Mr. Lewes is by far the most advanced representative,—in any case we are compelled to surrender the deeply inbred, and strangely persistent conviction, that somehow we were made to be free. Automatism and fatalism are, in the end, synonymous terms. The dominance of such systems implies the practical arrest of all the *free*

*forces*, which have been at work in the upward movement of the race, in civilization and religion, in discovery and art; and if it be under the overshadowing auspices of science that this slow and insidious abrading of the foundations of virtue and heroic effort is going on, is it any wonder that it should feel the force of the instinctive recoil of the better impulses of men? If science and fatalism are one and inseparable, then, of course, the overthrow of both is already decreed. But we have no such conception of science. It is only when she flounders in the dark that she comes upon so unseemly a companion. We hear much of the conflict of science and religion. But who is it that provokes it? Automatism and religion are forever at war; for if man be not free, responsibility is gone, and religion sinks away into a superstition or a cheat. Meantime there is honey in the carcass of the lion. The prodigious efforts these schools are making to push their way into the adytum of the human soul, have been rewarded by some of the most splendid and beneficent discoveries of our modern times, and great reforms and schemes of amelioration have sprung up in their track. Nay, our indebtedness is greater. The exclusive methods of the old metaphysical schools must, henceforth, be forever abandoned; and, under the goading of the most destructive iconoclasm, the new time will find new instruments for defending all those loftier convictions which give dignity and grandeur to human nature, and which lie at the foundation of religion and the state. These convictions, in any event, cannot be given up. But in standing for their defense, it is high time that some new method be found, that will intelligently grasp, and generously estimate, the prodigious labors and grand discoveries of the those, who are plying the physical universe for whatever secret it may contain.

## ARTICLE III.

## A STUDY OF FRANCIS XAVIER WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIS REPUTED MIRACLES IN JAPAN. \*

By Rev. Prof. W. E. PARSON, A. M., of the Imperial University of Tokio, Japan.

The relations of Japan with the outside world, up to the present time, may be clearly outlined and easily remembered, by keeping in mind the three politico-religious incursions which have taken place within the historic period. In the sixth century envoys arrived from China, and shortly after came the first Buddhist missionaries. Confucianism, which can scarcely be called a religion, came into Japan about the same date. The new religions modified the native Shinto faith. The new letters were as eagerly adopted as are the western Sciences and Languages in our own day. Thus the earliest known invasion of Japan was both literary and religious in its character, and was purely Chinese.

The second incursion took place in the sixteenth century; (not in the fifteenth as a recent author incorrectly states.)† The Order of the Jesuits was founded during the general uneasiness of Europe in the sixteenth century, at a time when Rome was in trepidation through fear of the results of the great revolution inaugurated by Luther and others. Obedience to the head of the Church was made the corner-stone of this new society. The first command that came to Francis Xavier, (who with Ignatius Loyola may be considered the founder of the order,) was that he should proceed to the East to convert India and the regions beyond; Rome's object most probably being to balance by gains in the East the losses that seemed inevitable in Europe. John the Third of Portugal was also desirous of consecrating his military triumphs in

\* A paper read before the Tokio Missionary Conference, in Tokio (Yedo), Japan, Dec. 4th, 1877.

† The Mikado's Empire, p. 84.

the East by spreading the gospel among the heathen. Francis Xavier's obedience was instant and complete, and he at once entered upon a voluntary exile, which was terminated—as in the case of many missionaries since—only by death at the post of duty. In the course of a long and toilsome missionary career, Xavier found himself led to Japan through the representations made to him by the Portuguese, and especially through the influence of one Hansiro, or Anjiro, a Japanese refugee, who had found his way to Malacca, and thence to India. This Anjiro, the first Japanese ever baptized, was given the name of Paul, and is frequently referred to in the letters of Xavier. Paul is said to have made the very shrewd remark, that it was a fortunate circumstance that no merchantmen came into Japan along with Francis Xavier. "If his countrymen," Paul of the Holy Faith remarks, "had seen on the one hand Master Francis preaching the holy law of God, and at the same time and place had also seen, on the other, the Christian merchant doing things contrary to the same law, they would have formed their judgment rather from the deeds of the merchants than from the word of the preacher, and would have asked Master Francis how it could be that the Christians looked forward to the good things of heaven after death, if they lived now as if there were no goods but those of this world? "He thanked God," he said, "that no European entered Japan along with Francis."\*

The Japanese crowded about Xavier from the first moment of his landing, and though his missionary work in Japan did not extend over much more than two years, his converts were numbered by thousands, and it seemed as if the whole Empire might speedily be converted to the cross, as it had before readily yielded to the persuasions of the Buddhists from China.

It is estimated that when the edict of expulsion was issued (1613), there were more than two millions of Christian converts, whose spiritual concerns were administered by no

\*The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier. By Henry James Colridge, of the Society of Jesus. London, Burnes & Oates. 1872. pp. 164, 165.

fewer than two hundred missionaries, three-fourths of whom were Jesuits. Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits were vying with each other as to which should secure the most converts.

But a triangular quarrel unfortunately broke out after some years, in which protestants (Dutch and English), Portuguese, and Japanese were concerned. There is some doubt now as to who were deepest in the wrong, but a charitable judgment would perhaps make all alike sharers in the blame. In any case the end was most disastrous. The Japanese, whether stirred up against the papists by the protestants, or against the protestants by the papists, or by Buddhists against both, rose in fury against protestant and papist alike, expelling them all from the country, and instituting a series of persecutions against the native Christians, which resulted in an almost complete extirpation of the Christian faith. A table of rewards was prepared by the government, in which the price paid for the apprehension of those bearing the Christian name was gradually increased as their number diminished. The curtain falls on this second epoch with the terrible tragedy of Shimabara. Thirty thousand converts assembled in a single province, and unable longer to endure the fierce persecutions directed against them, they fortified the castle of Shimabara, and openly defied the Government. They were soon overcome and put to the sword without mercy. The details of this tragedy are revolting, and there are records of heroic martyrdoms that bring to mind the earlier centuries. In the light of these facts we can understand why Mr. Mori, formerly the Minister from Japan at Washington, should write of "the Christian troubles which cost our nation fifty thousand lives, without much benefit either to the sufferers, or the religion."\* Then followed the edicts which sealed the country to the outside world for nearly two hundred and fifty years. To this day the influence of this second incursion is felt in Japan; there is a residuum of hate towards Rome,—a lurking jealousy of all

---

\*"Education in Japan," by Arinori Mori.

missionary work,—which places the Christian Church, and especially the Church of Rome, in a far less favorable light than she would have been, if Christianity had never been heard of in Japan before the advent of Commodore Perry. A prominent Japanese scholar, now Vice Minister of the Educational Department says: "The reason which led our countrymen to dislike the foreigner at one time past was simply this,—that they could not forget the unjust intentions of the European settlers in this country three hundred years ago, who attempted to encroach upon our Empire." Mr. Mori, says:—"The impression made by Christianity upon the whole nation was so entirely a perversion of its real character and proper influence, that our people came to regard it as an evil power of superstition and destruction."

Rev. Mr. Stout, a missionary of the Dutch Reformed Church at Nagasaki, where this lingering antipathy to Christianity is perhaps strongest, says in a private letter in response to some questions addressed to him:

"The Japanese seem much less ready to come into contact with Christianity at all, on account of their former knowledge of it. It is stigmatized by the very worst names that the language can afford. We are much hindered in our work on this account, and the Romish Christians say there are no additions scarcely made to their numbers." This was the second incursion.

The third incursion was from America, through Commodore Perry, who broke up the seclusion of nearly three centuries, and brought Japan into treaty relations with the United States and Europe. With this new opening came a new literature, firing all the old ambitious desires of the Japanese for knowledge. Christianity also came, not as in the sixteenth century, through men scheming after religious control for political purposes, or after political control for religious purposes, but rather let us hope fully in the spirit of its Divine Founder, who said "My Kingdom is not of this World."

These are briefly the three great epochs in the history of Japan as she stands related to the outside world. My purpose in this article is to examine with some care one point

connected with the second of these epochs. This point is the claim that Francis Xavier was possessed of the power to work miracles, and that he made frequent use of this power while in Japan. It is claimed by the Church of Rome that Xavier did have this power, that he healed the sick, that he had power to visit blasphemers with instant punishment, that he had the double gift of tongue, viz: the ability to preach in tongues of which he had learned little or nothing, and also the power to cause his listeners to hear each in his own tongue. This investigation is entered upon, not because it is deemed a debatable question as to whether any miracles were ever actually wrought by Francis Xavier, but for other reasons which will appear subsequently.

Before proceeding further, a word concerning Xavier may be in place here, as to the sincerity and devotion of the man, which are manifest in his whole life, and breathe through all his letters. More than three hundred years have passed away since the death of Xavier, and still the story of his life has a deep interest for all who wish to study the history of Christian Missions. This interest has deepened through the recent opening of the Japanese islands to commerce and Christianity. Wherever we get an insight into the motives that ruled the man, from the first moment of his instant obedience, to the command which carried him forever from his native haunts out to the forlorn East, down to the day on which he died on the coast of China, we cannot but yield our tribute of praise to his complete unselfishness, we must admire the entire surrender made by this man of God who went forth in obedience, like Abraham of old, not knowing whither he went. All this need lead us to no unduly exalted reverence for Xavier, since the records of Protestant as well as of Catholic missions in modern times will furnish us with hundreds of names of men who have gone forth in the same holy spirit of denial to the same divine work, finding in the end the same glorified death.

We must not make the mistake of refusing to yield to Xavier his due; nor must we listen to those who would depreciate the men of our own day in comparison with him.

Xavier's own words will best show us the spirit of the man, and the considerations that led him to come to Japan. "When once," he writes, "I had clearly recognized in myself the intimation and conviction that it was altogether the desire of God, and that it was a matter which his service required, that I should go to Japan, I gave myself up to the plan so entirely and irrevocably, that it seemed to me that if I were now to desist from what I had begun, I should be more wicked and more detestable than the very idolaters of Japan." \*

And again he says,—

"It is a great comfort to us to know that God, who judges the inmost feelings of the human heart, sees clearly with what wish, with what aim, with what prayer, and in search of what it is that we are moved to undertake this voyage to Japan."

And still farther,

"There are two things which support me against all the threats and preparations of the devil, who is already threatening hostilities and letting us know clearly enough that he means war to the knife, in order to frighten us from our course. The first of these is, as I have just said, the conviction that God knows with perfect clearness the rectitude of my intentions in undertaking the voyage. The second is, the most certain knowledge of the entire and absolute dominion of the will of God over all created things, so that no one of them can do anything at all except by the permission of God." He then goes on to enumerate some of the dangers that actually lay in his path, such as ignorance of the seas to be traversed, with their dangerous quicksands, and hidden docks; the extreme violence of the most furious storms, and "the risk of fierce attacks from the pirates who infest those seas." All this lets us into the mind and intention of the man, and makes us think favorably of him; and recalling the wonderful successes that attended and followed his labors we need not wonder that the Church of Rome looks upon

---

\* Life and Letters, p. 179.



Xavier as perhaps the greatest missionary since the days of Boniface, that saint and martyr who in the Eighth century undertook the conversion of Germany.

There is still another point I would hint at, without insisting upon it. It is, that as Xavier's life and times were thrown into that doubtful territory, which in a great conflict always lies between the two contending parties, we may in some special and rightful sense claim him as the property of the universal Church—the Catholic Church, in no narrow use of the word. Let me illustrate by our relations to Boniface to whom I have just referred. He is the property of the universal Church. His life lay within that period when no wide and vital division had yet taken place. His virtues, his faults are all the property of papist and protestant alike, since in the eighth century there was neither papist nor protestant, as we now use the terms. In much the same sense does Xavier belong to all the Church. He lived in the times when schools were forming, and the lines were beginning to be drawn. He was far distant from Europe during the hottest of the struggle, and knew not its meaning in full, nor could he have entered into its bitterness. His departure dates back to the most unsettled of those troublous days. It is not improbable that he and Calvin were together in their studies in Paris, but the departure of Xavier to the East at that particular time, joined with his complete absorption in his work, must have prevented him from ever forming any clear conception of the great revolution through which Christendom was destined to pass. He labored in harmony with the methods he had already learned, giving himself in devotion to the only Church he knew. We shall do him injustice to judge him, or his labors, apart from the time in which he lived. His method, honestly taken and conscientiously followed, were not always nor often such as we might now approve, but we must charitably recall the fact that he knew no other way.

Xavier was both a Catholic and a Jesuit; but he was a Catholic in the days of Luther, when it was possible for men to be so bewildered by conflicting opinions, as in the case of

Erasmus, or so hemmed about by indifferent friends, or so engrossed in their own immediate work, as in the case of Xavier himself, as not to be able to realize the greatness of the passing revolution. As one of the founders of the Society of Jesus, and as an intimate friend of Ignatius of Loyola, he belongs to that early period in the history of the order, when to be Jesuit was not necessarily to be possessed of that spirit which we can best describe in our time by calling it Jesuitical. For, whilst the name Christian, first given in derision at Antioch, has out-lived its original reproach, and is now a crown, the name Jesus, taken in pride, has outlived its glory, so that in common speech Jesuitism has become a synonym for the unscrupulous. We might therefore justly characterize Francis Xavier as an unjesuitical Jesuit, who went forth in consecration to carry what he believed to be a message of good-will to the most distant parts of the earth, in a time when distance was measured far otherwise than we measure it in our age of steam. Remembering these facts, taking into account the time in which he lived, and the conception of the Christian Church which prevailed in the sixteenth century, remembering also that the work to which Xavier was called left him neither time nor opportunity to deliver himself from the thralldom of the system under which he was educated, we shall love not less the noble spirit he displayed in his self-sacrifice down to the day of his death. We shall see also that his own friends have done him harm, in forgetting, that truth, like beauty, is most adorned when unadorned, and that they could add nothing by their fabrications to the thrillingly interesting story of his life. It is with especial reference to this aspect of Xavier's life and motives that I propose to examine into the story of his reputed miracles. For if it can be shown, not only that Xavier wrought no miracles, but that he had no thought of any, never pretended to work any, never made any claim to have wrought any, we shall succeed in delivering him from the evil suspicion under which he seems to lie. His name will cease to be a thing by which to work charms, and we shall think of him who bore it as none the less a Saint, knowing that

he never lent himself either to "pious frauds," or dishonorable method, and never laid claim to the possession of Divine powers.

We are confronted then with the statement made by Jesuit historians and biographers, that Xavier wrought sundry miracles in Japan,—as also in India, that his testimony concerning Christ was confirmed, as was that of the early apostles, by signs and wonders accompanying it.\* We are met by the further statement, which we should not probably be able to deny, that when the Saviour gave his last commission to his disciples to go into all the world, preaching the gospel to every creature, he also gave the promise that signs should follow them that believe. Mark, 16 : 17, 18. They should have power to cast out devils, to speak with tongues, to take up serpents, to drink deadly things without hurt, to heal the sick, and thus confirm the truth of their testimony. We are further told that there is no evidence that this power was withdrawn in the end of what we denominate apostolic times. It is claimed that the most of the miraculous signs above enumerated attended the preaching of Xavier, and it is further claimed that the fact, that such miracles as are here set down as seals of apostleship were actually wrought, is substantiated by full and ample testimony, of much the same kind as that by which the miracles of the New Testament are made worthy of our acceptance, the testimony in the former case being more valuable than in the latter inasmuch as it is sixteen centuries nearer to us. What shall we say to

---

\*The Auditors of the Rota quote the "promise, [*Relatio super sanctitate et miraculis Francisci Xavieri*,] made by our Lord as to the signs which shall follow those who believe, and also they quote the words of St. Paul that tongues are a sign, not to believers, but unbelievers." "They end by arguing that it was highly probable that Francis Xavier would have had this gift, inasmuch as it had been given to the apostles to enable them to be of use to those to whom they were sent, and the power of being understood by many of different languages at the same time seemed necessary to them, so also as this servant of God was sent to the East for the salvation of its peoples, it seems to follow that as in other respects he had received the spirit of the apostles, so also in this respect he should be like unto them."—Cole-ridge, pp. 383, 386.

these claims? From a careful study of the evidence, and after a close perusal of all the letters written from Japan by Xavier, one must come to the conclusion, that not only is there no good evidence that Xavier ever wrought a miracle, but, which is more to the purpose in our present study, that he never once made any such claim, never mentions in the most indirect way any miracle, or any act which could be construed as miraculous. On the other hand we find that Xavier does frequently speak of many difficult, and some impossible, things which we should not expect to find as hindrances to one endowed with supernatural gifts. For example, in regard to the difficulties ordinarily encountered in the acquisition of a new tongue, we find that Xavier was not exempt from such difficulties. He never refers in any of his letters to any supernatural aid in either acquiring or using the new languages spoken by him. On the other hand, he frequently refers to the difficulty he experiences owing to ignorance, and alludes to himself as diligently laboring to acquire these languages. The biographer of Xavier says:—

“Francis Xavier was assisted by the peculiar gift of apostolic men like himself; his sermons were not those of a foreigner who had scarcely learnt the language of the country in which he was speaking, but he spoke freely, flowingly, elegantly, as if he had lived in Japan all his life. There is evidence also that at this time he preached fluently in Chinese to the merchants of China who traded in the port of Simonseski. Another wonderful form of the same gift is also mentioned in the accounts of Francis while at Amanguchi, which reminds us of the manifestation of miraculous power on the day of Pentecost, when the Apostles spoke in one language and were understood in several. \* \* \* When several questions were put to Francis at the same time by different persons in the crowd, he made one answer which satisfied all.”

It does not require a great deal of discernment to discover the utter emptiness of all the arguments put forth by the Church of Rome, to establish Xavier's right to the claim here made in reference to him.

And, first, we must lay some stress on the fact that we know nothing at all about the character of the preaching of Xavier, beyond the hazy and untrustworthy traditions that have come down to us. We must also note the indirectness and indefiniteness of all the testimony in the case. In every instance the testimony comes at second or third hand, and never in any letter of his, or in any record made by Xavier himself. Our authority is always found in the accounts given by others concerning Xavier; and we can readily understand how such testimony might be prejudiced, perverted, or even manufactured. All this is to be borne in mind in connection with another important fact, which is that Xavier was a most copious letter-writer. He wrote down the most minute details of his plans and work, and was always communicating in a voluminous way with his Order, with his College at Goa, with the King of Portugal, with Ignatius Loyola, to whom especially he poured out his inmost soul, with Don Pedro de Sylva, Commandant of Malacca, and with many others. The consequence is that there are scores of his letters in existence, by means of which the whole life of Xavier may be traced in its minutest details. It is quite fair to ask whether it is possible that in all these letters, and especially in those dictated to Loyola, his associate in the founding of the Society to which he gave his life, pouring out his whole soul on other matters, entering into the minutest affairs connected with his arduous missionary labors, no mention should be made of the fact that his preaching was accompanied with signs and wonders? It would certainly be strange that a man possessed of apostolic gifts should speak of all his trials, plans, and successes, without ever hinting in the most distant way of any single miraculous sign attending his preaching. It would have been quite legitimate for him to have done so. The early apostles did so, and the record of their miracles stands in the same letters in which we read of their toils and trials, (Acts 19 : 11 ; 2 Cor. 12 : 12). The only conclusion left us, in the absence of any such allusion, is, that this whole matter of miracle-working

is so entirely apart from any record made by Xavier, and yet so exactly what we might presume he would have recorded, if he could have done so truthfully, that we must reject the tales as later than Xavier, and therefore a series of misconstructions, when they are not imitations, or pure fabrications.

Again, as to the second part of the miraculous claim, that many persons, gathered in one spot in Japan, should understand an answer given by Xavier to the various questions proposed to him; we need see nothing beyond the natural in this, if it were true. The people were of the neighboring provinces, and even had they come from more distant parts, the various dialects in the Japanese language are not so diverse as to render a foreigner using one dialect utterly unintelligible to those acquainted with other dialects. We may cite here a sample of the evidence on which the Church of Rome rests the claim of Xavier to apostleship and saintship:

"Another witness, examined at Goa, declares that he had heard from persons worthy of credit, and particularly from four brothers who had been companions of Francis when in India, that when he first went to Japan and knew little or nothing of the language, yet, though he preached without an interpreter, partly in Spanish, partly in Latin, partly in Portuguese, with a few Japanese words mixed up, he was understood by all as if he had spoken in the native language of each."

This is part of the testimony on which the canonization of Xavier was based. It is only necessary to look at it to discover its worthlessness as proof. Some one *at Goa* testifies as to what he *had heard* in connection with Xavier's work in Japan. The testimony itself, if it were worth anything, would prove nothing beyond the fact that Xavier must have made use of a strange medley, with Spanish, Latin, Portuguese, and "a few Japanese words mixed up."

Now, on going back to the original letter of Xavier on which the claim was first based, it would seem that a more careful reading of that letter would furnish all the answer needed to show the emptiness of the claim. It is a letter written by Xavier while he was yet in Japan to the Society

he left behind him at Goa. In this, as in all his other letters, there occurs no single word which could on the most liberal construction be made to bear evidence in favor of the assertion made by his biographer "that Francis Xavier was assisted by the peculiar gift of apostolic men like himself."

Viewing the matter fairly, in the light of all the facts, we can reach no other conclusion than that it is one of those conveniently exaggerated mistakes which has grown out of the extreme politeness of the Japanese, who would seem to understand the preacher, even when they did not; or else it is a pure fabrication, helped out by testimony manufactured subsequently, of which that prince of liars, Mendez Pinto, furnishes his due share.

If now we refer to the letter in question we shall find that it does contain very strong evidence on the other side. For we find in this letter that while Xavier makes no mention of miracles, and does not in any way intimate that he thinks himself possessed of miraculous gifts of speech, he does on the other hand refer to his own inability to use fluently the speech of the Japanese. He distinctly affirms that he has spent much of his time in trying to learn to speak Japanese, and he mentions the work of translating a certain book into Japanese as a "great labor," and closes by saying that he would not have been able to have accomplished these difficult tasks "if I had not had the work of these converts to help me."\*

This ought effectually to dispose of the whole case, and show us that Xavier himself never meant to resort to subterfuges, either to build up a new order, or to prop up a decaying system. He as one of the founders of the Order of the Jesuits, was less a Jesuit than some of his followers, and his testimony is more trustworthy than that of some of his biographers. The precise language of Xavier, written on another occasion to this same Society at Goa, is significant:—

"This island [Japan] is well fitted and prepared to receive the gospel. *If we all knew the language, I do not doubt but that*

---

\* Coleridge, p. 301. Vol. II.

*a great many Japanese would become Christians. God grant that we may soon acquire it well! as we have already for some time begun to understand it.*"\* The only meaning of which is, that he did not use it well, and understood it indifferently.

In another letter Xavier writes:

"If we knew the Japanese language, we should long ere this have been at work at this large uncultivated field with great fruit of souls. Paul [Anjiro] indeed has diligently preached the Gospel day and night. \* \* At present we are like so many dumb statues in the midst of the people."

One other point we are to bear in mind in passing. It is the fact that these letters of Xavier were sent back to Europe for a purpose. That purpose is indicated in one sentence that may be found in one of these letters:—

"Would to God that these divine consolations which God so graciously gives us in the midst of our labors might not only be related by me, but also some experience of them be sent to our European Universities, to be tasted as well as heard of!" It is in a line with this that he is led in one place to exult over his discomfiture of the bonzes in argument, saying "the most glorious victory over most formidable enemies was gained." Is it not legitimate to ask whether, if any more signal, because miraculous, victory, such as attended Elijah in his contest with the priests of Baal, had been added to this "most glorious victory over most formidable enemies," Xavier would not have recorded it in full, or in part, or at least have made some allusion to it?

The argument is purely inferential, but under the circumstances it has much weight, and leads to the conviction that not only was no miracle ever wrought by Xavier, but that he himself never claimed to have wrought any. This statement is made thus sweeping in order to cover the whole of his life and all his letters. There might seem to be one exception to this, in a letter written from India, in which Xavier records the recovery of a sick woman in answer to his prayers; but if we look more closely we shall find that he

---

\* Coleridge, 242, Vol. II.



uses no language in that connection that would justify the inference that the cure was miraculous, or brought about by any supernatural power he may have possessed. On the contrary he speaks of it as a "*miracle which God had wrought.*" It was simply a case of recovery from sickness in answer to the prayer of faith, such as we are all familiar with, and commonly allude to in terms which, though they might suggest the miraculous, are well understood to involve no possession of supernatural power on the part of the petitioner. It is not peculiar to Rome to believe that the prayer of faith shall save the sick. James announced it in his epistle, (James 5 : 15), and the Christian Church has always professed to both believe and act upon the promise there recorded. Luther at the bedside of Melancthon is a well-known case in point. After a fervent prayer Luther said, "Be of good cheer, Philip, you will not die," and from that moment Melancthon began to revive and recover consciousness, and was afterward restored to health. This might be referred to as miraculous, and yet no one would find in the incident, more than at the most, a remarkable instance of an answer to the prayer of faith.

In like manner, the mention by Xavier of this only case that could possibly be construed as miraculous, instead of furnishing any proof that he wrought miracles, is rather proof that it was the farthest thought possible from his mind; and is proof also that, had there been any case in which he had thought himself aided by extraordinary divine power, we should have found him, as a truthful man, giving it, a place in his letters; at least in one to Loyola, where we find recorded this, the only seeming miracle.\* In justice to Xavier, therefore, we must conclude that the thrusting of miraculous gifts upon him was posthumous, that the most important part of the evidence has been manufactured for priestly purposes, to bolster up a decaying faith, or to attrib-

---

\* In another letter he says, "GOD WAS MOVED BY FAITH, and restored to a great number of sick persons health both of body and soul."—Vol. I., p. 155.

ute to the greatest missionary saint on the Roman calendar the possession of supernatural gifts, and thus make him appear to be what his biographer calls him—"the modern Apostle of the East."

It might seem superfluous to offer any further evidence in the same line; but it may not be unprofitable to make a short excursus, glancing at the character of the miracles attributed to Francis Xavier.

I shall quote one miracle entire, as narrated by Xavier's biographer, who says that the Japanese converts gave their testimony that many sick persons were healed by the sign of the cross, or by holy water; very justly adding the statement that "the most conspicuous prodigy of this time was, in general, the holy mortified lives of the ambassadors of Christ." Before quoting this miracle I may remark that, it is not improbable that some of the simple-minded of the Japanese, who heard Xavier narrate the miracles of Christ, confounded Xavier the narrator of them with Christ the author of them. Tradition made sad havoc with plain facts, and the commonest natural occurrences were construed into miracles, or invested with a semi-miraculous halo, which it is not in the nature of either time or Rome to dissipate.

I quote the following miracle from Xavier's biography, calling attention to the fact that it is not narrated in Francis Xavier's own words, and is not found in any one of his letters, or even remotely referred to, for which fact his biographer seems to apologize:

"Francis Xavier does not tell us himself of other incidents which attended his preaching, which have come to us on the testimony of eye-witnesses. No reader of his life will be surprised to find that now again his apostolate was illustrated by miracles. The most famous of these could not have been the first, for it was wrought in favor of the only daughter of a nobleman whom, in his agony of bereavement after her death, the new converts urged to recommend his case to the God of the Christians, and to have recourse to the prayers of the great teacher of the Portuguese. The father went to Francis Xavier, and threw himself at his feet; but

sorrow choked his utterance, and he could say nothing. Francis retired for a few moments \* \* into the little oratory in which he said mass, and after a short, fervent, prayer, came back to the poor suppliant and told him to go, that his prayers were heard. He said nothing more, and the nobleman was grieved and hurt. In this frame of mind he went homewards, and was met, first by a servant, who told him that his daughter was alive, and then by the girl herself, who ran to him and threw herself on his neck. \* \* Both father and child were at once instructed and baptized.”\*

It is only necessary to read this account to see how it in all probability originated. It corresponds so closely throughout with the Bible account of the healing of the centurion's servant that it is impossible not to think it originated through that narrative, as probably given to the Japanese by Xavier himself, with no thought of the use it should be put to, through mutilation and misconstruction after his death.

Another miracle is given bearing a striking likeness to one of the New Testament miracles. Xavier is said to have been walking by the sea-shore, where some fishermen were dragging their nets, but with no success. They had toiled long and taken nothing, when Francis blessed their nets with the sign of the cross, and bade them cast into the sea again. This time the nets were found full to abundance, and that part of the sea remained afterwards remarkably productive.

Another time a village was delivered from pestilence by the prayers of Xavier. Another time a deformed child was healed; again a blind man was restored to sight; again a leper was healed. At still another time, “a Japanese had been insulting and jeering at Francis, who turned to him and said gently, ‘God preserve your mouth, friend!’ The man was struck at once with a horrible and noisome cancerous disease in his mouth.”

To these miracles might be added the most marvelous story of the small boat, lost for days at sea, and finally recovered through the prayers of Xavier. This story rests solely on

---

\*Coleridge, Vol. II., pp. 284, 285.

the testimony of Mendez Pinto, whom even the credulous biographer of Xavier hesitates to believe. The internal character of the narration shows it to be a mere traveler's tale, put in that form because the writer of it was a chronicler friendly to Xavier, and to Rome.

But it is not necessary to follow the subject further. We have gone into it thus minutely to show that in rejecting the miracles of Rome, we have good reason for so doing, in the cases that seem most probable, and are best attested. A further result of our study may be to show us by contrast the superior kind of evidence we possess in favor of the New Testament miracles, whether we consider the internal character of the miracles themselves, or the external character of the testimony in regard to them. And, further, we may learn something of the subterfuges to which a decaying faith may resort, to keep itself alive in ancient haunts, or to win for itself a way in new fields. And further, and especially, we may have done something to rescue the name and fame of Xavier from the suspicions cast upon him by the Church of Rome. For it is manifest that much injury is done to the memory of Xavier by linking his work with the suspicious claim which he living never made—the claim that he was endowed with apostolic gifts, by virtue of which he wrought miracles of healing similar to those recorded in the first days of Christianity. Such a claim could not long be maintained without doing discredit to the actual labors of Xavier, and at the same time throwing the shadow of that discredit back upon the record of the earlier miracles. For if those early miracles are to be disturbed in their pre-eminence, they will ultimately be overthrown by doubt.

Lecky in his thoughtful, though not impartial book, on the *Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, very pertinently asks:

“What proof of the falsehood of Catholicism could be more decisive than that it was unable to establish any of the immense mass of miracles which it had asserted, that all these were resolved and dissipated before a searching criticism, that saints had been canonized, forms of worship established,

countless bulls and pastorals issued, innumerable rejoicings, pageantries, processions, and pilgrimages authoritatively instituted, public opinion all through Christendom violently and continuously agitated on account of alleged events which had either no existence, or which were altogether misunderstood?"\*

This, then, is our conclusion, that while the Protestant estimate of Xavier has commonly been unfair in denying him even his due; the Papist estimate of him has been even more unjust in attributing to him the power of working miracles, and the gift of tongues. The true judgment would probably be reached by striking an average between these two estimates. That Xavier might be called a Saint, even in the apostolic sense, we do not question; but that he should have been canonized because of the supposed possession of supernatural gifts, was a perversion of facts to which the honest Xavier would not have lent himself. For there is not in the whole life of the man one act or fact savoring of pious fraud; but those who came after him, less scrupulous than he, have built up upon the merest substratum of fact a superstructure of falsehood, which is all the more deceptive because not wholly fictitious.

Writing from the Capitol of the Empire of Japan, I am able to trace but faintly any influence left by this first of all the Christian missionaries to these shores. A few words, such as Crucifix, Maria, Santa, and Padre, have been retained in the language during all these intervening years. The sign of the cross, and the chief of the Christian festivals, have been faintly remembered. When this is told, all is known that Rome with hundreds of missionaries and thousands of converts succeeded in doing for the Japan of this day: not forgetting to place to the other side of the score that residuum of hate, of which we have already spoken, that undercurrent of disfavor with respect to Rome, and through her with re-

\* Lecky's *Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. I., pp. 163, 164. Compare also p. 143, et seq.

spect to Christianity in general, which has a place in the minds of the majority of intelligent Japanese. There can be no doubt that the feeling in regard to "Vaticanism," represented in England by Mr. Gladstone, and in Germany by Prince Bismarck, is to-day strong and wide-spread in these distant islands of the sea.

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### GUARANTEES TO FAITH.

By Prof. S. A. REPASS, D. D., Salem, Va.

Unless we are greatly mistaken, ours is an age characterized by unusual anti-christian activity. Certainly in no period in the history of Christianity in this land, have the principles of positive unbelief been disseminated with greater diligence. These have found place in not a few of our most respectable Reviews, home and foreign, and are thence copied into many of our most widely circulated secular papers and more popular magazines. Not a few of the pulpits of the land, tired of dealing with the old and positive teachings of the Bible, have become infected with the same spirit of unbelief, and give a sound as startling as it is discordant with all proper faith in the authority of Revelation. These latter may not directly attack the truths of holy scripture with the weapons of science. They would appear too consistent to prostitute thus openly their vocation. They are however none the less in sympathy with the skepticism of the age: only they manifest this in another way. The spirit of unbelief is upon them, and they prophecy against eternal punishment, against Hell and Damnation, with a boldness and persistency that are truly astonishing. And all this through a professed love of truth.

These attacks are none the less bold than those directed against Christianity by modern science. The latter, however, aims directly and confessedly at the very foundations of the Christian system. The "scientific method" demands that

Revelation shall be subjected to the severest critical tests—that nothing shall be accepted as truth upon the testimony of former ages. It virtually denies all belief in the agency of the Supernatural; or if the existence of this be admitted, it is as a mere abstraction, and has no practical claims whatever upon our faith. Belief in the miracles of a former age is accounted for upon the principle of “prepossession” in those who recorded them. That the evangelists and disciples of Christ believed that these things were really done is not for a moment denied. They were not however competent witnesses; for men have often been deceived, no less by the sense of sight than by the undue excitement of their mental states. Human testimony has been so far analyzed as to lead to the discovery of its subjective element, and this has been declared wholly unreliable. The miracles of the Bible are compared with those of the Church of Rome; and the revelations made to “holy men of old,” through dreams and visions, with the phenomena of Mesmerism and Spiritualism. The grounds upon which we reject either are regarded as identical in principle. According to the “scientific method,” the one class has been discovered to have been produced by mere trickery; the other, when the same method is rigorously applied, suffers the same exposure.

This opposition to a positive Revelation is waged from every quarter of the scientific world. There is no distinctive truth of the Bible which is not attacked. Even the existence of an infinite personal will, or of a personal Creator, is denied. Pantheism, Materialism, the manifold forms of Rationalism—all appear in much of our periodical literature. From every department of science and human knowledge come these anti-Christian principles. It requires only a slight knowledge of the history of error, in connection with that of human nature, to lead to this conclusion, that we are living in an age in which seeds are being sown that will ripen into a harvest rich in Infidelity.

It may be replied to all this, that these are really forms of errors long since exposed and refuted. The fact we readily admit; the conclusion, however, which may be drawn is exceedingly

faulty, viz: That the Church need not concern itself with these errors—that God will take care of his truth, &c. These persons forget that the world moves, and that error moves along and grows with it. Science is making wonderful advances in our day, and in all the departments of human knowledge there is unwonted activity. Infidelity is always first to occupy the advanced positions in the march of progress. Less conservative than those believing in Revelation, and without the restraints of positive truth or tradition wanting in the subjective elements of faith, these disciples of science push boldly forward in their investigations, and recklessly plant their anti-Christian standards upon the very outposts of human progress. Our fears are not from the errors themselves, nor from the forms they are assuming. They have a practical ground. How are they likely to affect the people? is the question which should give direction to our conduct. Will not these seeds fall into a soil most favorable to their germination and growth? We believe that the social, political and religious condition of the people are favorable to this movement against Christianity. The ground is in much part prepared, the enemy is diligent in sowing tares, and the harvest will be certain to mature in due time. It is of little practical interest that truth has prevailed in all former conflicts, especially if one should seek to justify indifference to these issues from that point of view. We know that unbelief has flourished elsewhere, and although subsequently overcome, it has been attended with the destruction of many. We know also that the battle between Christianity and Infidelity has never been fought in our land, and knowing our enemy we cannot hope to escape an engagement. Wisdom demands the utmost vigilance on our part. The signs of the times clearly indicate the fact no less than the severity of the coming conflict. To ignore these issues, or to fail in preparing to meet them, is grossly culpable because treachery to the truth.

Under these circumstances, what is the duty of those who are more especially charged with the defence of Christian truth? How can they best *guarantee* the faith delivered



through revelation made to prophets and apostles? Certainly not by ignoring the issues now being made. To despise an enemy is to give him advantage. Here, too, the price of liberty and safety is vigilance.

It will be sufficient in this article to note, under two heads, those *guarantees to faith* most vital in this, and indeed in every controversy of a similar character. Not that we would separate them, for only when united do they form a true defence against error. Neither are these urged as proper to be employed in instruction from our pulpits. The burden of all preaching should be now, as in the times of the holy apostle, "Christ and him crucified." But our ministry cannot afford to remain ignorant of anything that may aid them in maintaining the truth of Christianity. Very much must be learned which may not be directly used in the pulpit. He best preserves the faith who can best defend, as well as unfold and enforce it.

THE APOLOGIES OF CHRISTIANITY SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY STUDIED.

These may be gathered from history, from science, from a right anthropology, and, above all, directly from the word of God. These investigations may be carried into every department of truth, human and divine. Defences may and should be constructed over against every fortification real, or apparent, erected or occupied, by the enemy. Let the war be offensive and defensive, and carried against the very citadels of unbelief. *The Natural Sciences*, thoroughly and critically studied, testify with unmistakable unanimity to revealed truth. Christianity has suffered much through the indiscreet zeal of many of her defenders. God's works in Nature have been set over against his works in Revelation, thereby opposing him to himself. Ignorant of the harmony prevailing throughout the works of God, or frightened by the mere semblance of opposition, these have thought to preserve the one by attacking the other, inflicting in this way as much real injury upon the Church as the most undisguised enemies. Christian Philosophy has no more to discover a starting point for its investigations than Christian Theology. To the for-

mer no less than to the latter the  $\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\omega$  is given, and from this, one need fear no real conflict can ensue upon the most thorough research. *History* furnishes ample stores for Christian Apologetics. A denial of the truth of Revelation is tantamount to a denial of the unity of history, no less than to the significance of the changes and progress of nations. To deny the Teleology of History is at once to surrender all claims to philosophical thinking. Only when viewed in connection with the holy purposes of God, as revealed in his Word, does it possess any significance, or teach any lessons of true wisdom. *Man*, the noblest work of God, is the highest revelation in nature of the gracious purposes of his Creator. His wonderful endowments, his lordship over all beneath him, the very discord now existing in his being, point to Holy Scripture for their origin and solution. He is either what the word of God declares him to be, or he continues to be the Sphinx, the human head with the body of an animal. A true anthropology is certainly necessary to a clear intellectual apprehension of the Scriptures. Our nature properly understood furnishes a powerful vindication of revealed truth. *The testimony of the Bible* to its own truthfulness is most convincing. It is consistent throughout, and that not only with itself, but with all truth. The evidences furnished by it, although in themselves superior to all others, derive singular confirmation when studied in connection with the other works of God indicated. He, who rises to a true conception of the higher unity existing amongst all these, is entrenched in the strongest defences possible outside of an enlightened Christian experience.

This is no more than an indication, and a very imperfect one, of a few of the sources whence may be drawn arguments in defence of Christianity. There is no department of knowledge within the reach of human investigation which is not in harmony with the truths of our holy religion. A system of apologetics may be constructed of materials collected from every point in the natural and spiritual universe, consistent throughout with itself, and in entire harmony with evangelical truth. Such a work has never been accomplished. The

distinguished Pascal entered upon the undertaking, and had his life been spared, he would have added largely to his reputation by whatever additional progress he might have made with the work. Even in the faint outlines of the work left on record, we are filled with wonder no less at the vastness of the plan itself, than with his clear conceptions of the subject.

But however complete in itself, no system of apologetics can furnish absolute security against critical unbelief. Connected with this there is another factor even more important, yea, essential, to the perfection of our defence. This we may express in the following proposition :

THE SUREST GUARANTEE TO FAITH IS FAITH ITSELF.

This is not a truism, much less an unmeaning proposition. The objective faith has its surest, its only impregnable defence in faith considered as an evangelical principle, firmly rooted in the heart, viewed as the centre of the human personality. There is, and indeed there can be, no position assumed or taken on the *formal principle* which is not open to more or less successful attack from unbelief. The reason of this is found in the very nature of revealed truth. This has its origin and its special end in the domain of spirit. Spirit must cognize and receive it; otherwise its proper power is lost.

The truth of the proposition above laid down is attested by the history of Christianity manifested in the Church. It is verified in manifold instances from the earliest period of Christianity to the present time. Whenever and wherever the truths of Scripture were made to rest upon a purely objective basis of proof, openings have been made in the citadel and the enemy has found entrance. When the true life of Christianity was lost, or the Church rested her defence upon the objective word or evidence alone, instead of evangelical faith in that word—upon miracles and prophecy, and canon and tradition, rather than upon the *material principle*, as relatively independent of these, (see Luther's work on the "Freedom of the Christian Man"), she has found herself, if not defenceless, in imminent peril.

This was the condition of the Church in England at the

rise of Deism in the eighteenth century. The doctrine of justification by faith was virtually lost, or held only as a dogma. Faith as the fundamental principle of all Christian life—as the very law of the new creation—had given way to the barest objectivism. Christianity itself was viewed rather as an improved code of ethics, and the Church regarded as an organization bound together by sundry excellent rules and principles of government, based upon evidences drawn from certain supernatural manifestations, such as miracles and prophecy, together with traditions reaching out from the early Church and continuing in an unbroken chain down to the present. Deism attacked this structure of ecclesiasticism with arguments drawn from metaphysics and natural philosophy, and the result was, that very many being without the true and only sure foundation were driven into unbelief. During this conflict the English Church built up the grandest systems apologetics ever constructed by human thought. But these were in general characterized by the spirit of the age, viz., pure Objectivism. They did not venture beyond the *formal principle* of truth, or rather did not build their defences upon the only sure foundation, faith. The Church was loved and defended as an imposing relic of antiquity. Its true life had become buried amid a heap of choice ecclesiastical rubbish, too unwieldy to be used and too venerable to be removed. The movement begun by the Wesleys aimed at the restoration of the lost doctrine, or principle of justification as enunciated by Luther. The result of that movement has become a fact of history, and its success was mainly due to the presence of this vital factor. It may not be generally recognized that the Church of England to-day largely owes her evangelical life, so far as this exists, to the revival introduced through the agency of the Wesleys and Whitefield; nor that England is more indebted to them for her riddance from Deism than to the apologetical systems of learned divines. But a little impartial study of the history of those times and of the principles then introduced, will confirm the truth of the statement.

The history of the Church on the Continent was but a

repetition of the same conflict, or rather a continuation of it. Rationalism was only English Deism Germanized, and Orthodoxy, so far as concerned its methods of defence, was on the same principle as the apologies of English divines. The whole was a vast system of Objectivism, beautiful and complete when viewed at a distance, but vulnerable in its most vital parts.

The description of the English Church already given applies, as regards its condition, quite as well to that of Germany. For that the latter rested upon *pure* objective truth does not vitiate the argument we are making. The Anglican Church did not suffer from these attacks, because she mingled much of error with truth, but because her systems of defence were incomplete and faulty in their very essence. Germany held the truth in its purity. Her Dogmatic systems constructed in the seventeenth century are wonders of their kind. All that human thought and the subtlest analysis could accomplish, were brought into requisition. This period was so nearly akin in form, and as we think in spirit likewise, to that remarkable intellectual movement of mediævalism, that it is most aptly characterized as the scholasticism of the seventeenth century. The guarantees of Christianity were sought in the external evidences. To these were brought the subtlest dialectics of these Protestant schoolmen. All was resolved into an Objectivism as perfect as human learning and logic could make it. That doctrine of a standing or a falling Church, justification by faith, was dogmatized, and thereby relegated to the *formal principle*. The subjective element in faith, in which is found its evangelical scriptural principle, was practically lost. This was Orthodoxy, not orthodoxy. Rationalism directed its attacks against this system of defence, or rather against this one-sided method of viewing truth. That it was largely successful is one of the best attested facts of the history of that period, and the result was mainly due to the character of the defences made by the Church.

Neither was Pietism, nor the diverse sickly forms of su-  
Vol. VIII. No. 2.

pernaturalism, able to withstand the attacks of Rationalism. These were quite as guilty of a one-sidedness as Orthodoxy. In fact they possessed nothing of the consistency and muscular strength of the latter. We are not now concerned with the long and bitter controversy between the two, but only of these with the reigning unbelief. Many of the orthodox had not gone to the extremes of Orthodoxy; and many were classed with the Pietists, who were not guilty of holding the errors of Pietism.

The distinction is real, not fanciful. Orthodoxy is only another name for Objectivism, viz., that which holds the pure *form* of truth without possessing its life and power. That there were many answering to this description is a fact as easily determined as the relation between a tree and its fruits, or between cause and its effects. Pietism is the opposite extreme, and is characterized by bare subjectivity, viz., that which, undervaluing the importance of a pure faith, and the authority of objective truth, attempted to ground itself upon pious thoughts and feelings. As over against these, much more of true piety was found among the orthodox than among these pectoral Christians.

Against Rationalism these forms of Pietism were powerless. In the very nature of the case evangelical Religion can have no real existence, much less any sure defence apart from connection with Holy Scripture. The latter was attacked, and with it all those systems of false defence reared upon merely subjective states. Relying upon these, Pietism was soon forced to abandon many of the evidences thought to be impregnable. Unable to maintain the position taken, and without the knowledge of a safe line of retreat, it was driven to the necessity of surrendering to the enemy, and of entering into a conditional alliance with them. The ranks of Rationalism were largely filled with recruits from this source.

That a different result will follow in the controversy preparing in our land, there is no good ground to hope. Wherever the same principle of evidence is present and the antagonisms of unbelief exist, there the result will be repeated.

American pietism, of which there are many and sundry kinds, cannot escape the consequences we have indicated. It really possesses less consistency, and fewer elements of real strength, than its German parent. All the way from the gross errors of Thomas Münzer to the refined religious Pantheism of Schleiermacher, we find the representatives of this school. The inevitable tendencies of the errors held, or rather of the very principle of their religious life, are unknown to themselves. It will as little stand the crucible of the "Scientific method" as the phenomena of Mesmerism.

The conclusion reached is that stated in our second proposition: *The surest guarantee to the faith is faith itself.* The controversies indicated prove the truth of the proposition. But Christian faith can have no real existence except as it grows from and is founded upon the written word; and the security of that faith will be in proportion to the degree in which the saving truths of that word are clearly apprehended. Religious subjectivism, considered apart from the faith as its object, can afford no sure defence against unbelief. Neither can systems of truth, be they never so complete, guarantee that truth to those holding it, apart from evangelical faith vested in the personality. Justification by faith is the golden link which unites the formal and material principle of all revealed truth, and when this is wanting, or is not clearly apprehended in its relation to both, there can be no security against the antagonisms of error.

The reason is apparent. The strongest proof of the truth of Revelation is found in a true Christian experience; not that degenerate experience which grows from pietistic formalism, and feeds itself upon its own diseased subjective states, but that which *knows* because it has *believed* the record which God has given in his word. From this comes the true and the only true *certitude* of faith. Because Scripture has been given to reveal sin and salvation, he who realizes in an evangelical sense his sinfulness, and is saved from its condemnation and power through faith in Jesus Christ, is on a foundation which cannot be shaken by the most critical unbelief. He possesses that true Christian gnosis which is far above



the boasted gnosis of infidelity. To quote the language of a well known American author: "To him who knows from experience that he is a sinner, justly exposed to the wrath of a holy God, and who believes that Christ is his Saviour, who satisfies all his spiritual wants and aspirations, the objections of infidelity have as little weight as water upon a rock, or paper balls upon a fort." His faith does not merely rest upon the fact of miracles and prophecy, and theories of inspiration, or the doctrine concerning the Christ, but on Christ himself as therein revealed. Clad in this armor he can go forth to battle with the invincible confidence of David, knowing in whom he trusts, and assured of final victory over every enemy. This is to him a surer guarantee of the truth of Christianity, than the most thorough knowledge of the most perfect systems of Apologetics ever constructed.

The issues here presented do no violence to the word of God. Neither do they undervalue the authority of that word. On the contrary they preserve it in its true intent and nature. Truth was not given to be regarded as an end itself, but for our salvation. In order to this it must be believed. Without such hearty acceptance it cannot be truly known. He contends for what he does not possess who has not believed with the heart unto righteousness; he contends for a phantom whose faith rests on any other basis than the revealed truth of God.

The line of thought indicated in this article leads to directly practical conclusions. If we have not sounded a false alarm in regard to the positive advances of infidelity, it certainly concerns the defenders of Christianity, the ministry, to consider the best means of protection against the enemy. To remain ignorant of the weapons employed by the adversaries, is to be guilty of presumption, which, in the emergency, is little less than infidelity itself. And to trust in the strength of these outer defences alone, is to do battle without the presence or the order of the Captain of our salvation. In the union of the two is found our strength.

These issues involve responsibilities of the gravest character. Just in proportion as the pure faith of God's word is



corrupted or surrendered, is the foundation of salvation impaired. Whether it be by heresy or conscious unbelief, error is in its very nature destructive. To destroy the souls of men by teaching untruth, or to build insecurely and thereby invite these attacks of infidelity which may cause others to perish, is not less culpable than to destroy souls by a wicked example. The sphere of the pulpit is nearest the very citadel of truth. If that be true to its sacred relations, rightly dividing the word of God to those of whose souls we have charge, then will be an inner harmony which cannot be broken by the discords of infidelity. He alone stands in the strength of God, who stands in the exercise of conscious faith in the truth of his word. These guarantees are sure, because they conform to what is true in all the works and ways of God. To possess them is to possess the unfailing certitude of faith. He shall not be brought to confusion who is on this foundation.

## ARTICLE V.

### WHAT IS THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TOWARD HER DELINQUENT MEMBERS?

Rev. A. W. LILLY, A. M., York, Pa.

Pastors and people have worried over this question. Measures have been devised and experiments made in the hope of reaching some results, that might serve as satisfactory solutions of the problem. It is necessarily a question of discipline, which adds to the difficulty of striking a line of action that will meet all cases. The exercise of discipline is not only a prerogative of the Church, but because of her responsible relation to her members, it is clearly her duty. Her great aim and effort are to be directed to the cultivation of holiness of heart and life among all her members. Amid the endless variety of nature and disposition in the membership, it requires constant watchfulness, earnest admonition, careful instruction, and judicious discipline, to bring all up to

their duty and keep them abreast in the ways and works of the Lord.

The Church is sometimes termed the "Assembly of the Saints;" often she is called "The Branch of God's planting;" and sometimes she is styled the "Fold of Christ." In any of these forms of expression in relation to the church, membership implies a personal and sacred alliance with Christ and a mutual relation to each other. But this last appellation is perhaps the most appropriate and expressive as related to this statement of the question. The Church is the "Fold" of which Christ is the chief Shepherd. Into it Christian believers are gathered for instruction and protection, and sympathy, and discipline, and for "growth in grace and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ." It is a body of Christian believers bound together in the strongest bonds of faith and love, and associated with each other in the most intimate communion; each one forming a part of the whole and a part of each other; and altogether forming a spiritual alliance for mutual strength and influence, and defence and encouragement.

#### OBLIGATIONS ASSUMED IN CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

The terms upon which applicants are received into the Church are both definite and obligatory. Every form of admission in evangelical churches imposes compliance with the rules and duties of consistent Christian life, and is coupled with the promise, either expressed or implied, of being obedient subjects of divine grace. In the Lutheran Church applicants for membership are required to give to the church council "satisfactory evidence of repentance of sins and true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." Also in the rite of confirmation, when the solemn act of consecration to God and his service is publicly consummated, the sacred vow is made "to live according to the doctrines and precepts of Christ and adorn them by a holy walk and conversation until death." Substantially the same obligations are assumed by those who unite with a congregation by certificates of membership from other congregations.

In this assumption of the vows of the Christian religion there is no reservation. It implies the surrender of the heart to Christ, and the joining of hands with the brotherhood of believers in good faith. It is not a mere form or custom that meets the demands of the age and gratifies the desire of friends, but a sacred covenant with Christ. It is a pledge of fidelity to the requirements of the Gospel, which admits of of no wide latitude of living, and no subordination of God's word to the whims and notions of men. But it is the voluntary "putting on of Christ;" the profession of "walking in the Light;" the public avowal of being "not conformed to this world but transformed by the renewing of the mind." It is the obligation of following the Saviour's first and great command 'to love God with all the heart and with all the soul and with all the mind and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself.'

#### SPHERE OF CHURCH LIFE.

The Christian Church, in her nature and appointments, is a reforming and evangelizing power in the earth. Her history is brilliant with the statements of her triumphs, and the prophecies of her future conquests impart inspiration to the courage and faith of her people. What the Church is designed to accomplish in her organized and collective capacity, her members individually are to accomplish. Her grand and wide-reaching victories lie in the energy and fidelity and Christ-like spirit of her members. They are the "light of the world." They are the "spiritual cities set on the hill-tops of Christendom;" and their good works are to be seen of men and lead them to glorify God.

A community should always be better because of the presence of a Christian congregation. Christian people imbued with the spirit of the Master should stand out in a community as a mighty influence for good, and a strong, united and determined force against every form of vice and immorality. They should elevate the standard of morals and education and culture, and abound in faith and good works. And when the members of a congregation are consistent and uni-

ted in the spirit of love and vital godliness and activity, these results never fail. To this evangelizing influence every member is a contributor; it is the burden of his profession and the proper sphere of his church life. There is without doubt, a conviction on the mind of a member received into the Church, that he is "coming after Christ," and needs to bear his cross daily. The impression is deep and abiding that wilful sin must be abandoned, evil associations abhorred, holiness of heart and life practiced, and God's vineyard cultivated. Not one, or a few, but all, are alike to fill their sphere in the Church of Christ. Membership there is not a mere union for defense and self-satisfaction, but a union for aggressive work and for glorious achievements for Christ: not for ease and ornament but for cross-bearing and self-denials and for the conversion of souls. But what failures! what delinquencies!

#### PREVAILING DELINQUENCIES.

If all who name the name of Jesus were consistent and constant in "His doctrines and precepts," what a power the Church would be! For the most potent and irresistible influence in the earth is the union of the people of God joined in "one heart and one mind;" clothed in the beauty of holiness and endowed with the all-conquering power of faith. Then would the Church ascend to the excellence and majesty of Solomon's poetic picture, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."

But her beauty and efficiency are sadly marred by the multitude of her delinquents. Notwithstanding the solemn pledges of fidelity, and the consciousness of carrying heavy responsibilities because of this sacred relation to the Church of Christ, there exist a lamentable neglect of duty and a wilful disregard of personal obligations assumed in a profession of faith. And this delinquency is not peculiar to this age, or any other age of the Church. Ever since the days of Cain, the Church of God has been afflicted with delinquency and backsliding and apostacy. Joshua discovered a covetous Achan in the camp of Israel. The Prophet Elisha had in his

confidence and daily service the avaricious Gehazi. The Saviour Himself had in His school of Apostles the traitorous Judas. And the Apostles were confronted and had to treat with the falsehood of Ananias and Sapphira. Every shade of error and moral obliquity has abounded in the Church.

In our estimates there are grades in delinquency. Not unfrequently there are very liberal views held and expressed in regard to what constitutes delinquency in Christian life and duty. Custom and conventionalities are not unfrequently made the rule of interpreting Christian morals, rather than the word of God and the discipline of the Church founded on that Word. By delinquency, in this question, is meant *the failure of fulfilling the vows of a Christian profession, either by wilful neglect or wilful transgression.* Perfect obedience is not claimed, but a faithful and prayerful effort to live right, and a regular and conscientious use of the means of grace. Less than this cannot be accepted, because this much all are able to do.

Union with the Church is not an expression of personal holiness and moral beauty, with which to adorn her and lay her under obligation, but a public confession of personal weakness and spiritual necessities. Neither is it a spiritual partnership that may be continued or dissolved at pleasure, but a sincere and unreserved consecration of heart and mind and means to Christ and his kingdom for all time. According to our Formula of Government, members are required 'to lead a Christian life; perform all the duties required of them in the Scriptures. It is the duty of adult members to attend the public worship of God, partake of the Lord's Supper whenever opportunity affords. Parents shall educate their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; teach them the doctrines, and subject them to the ordinances of the Church.' A wilful neglect of these duties, and a wilful violation of God's word and Christian propriety, is clearly a delinquency.

Habitual and voluntary absence from the worship of God in the sanctuary is a failure of duty, and is unbecoming a

Christian. An indifferent feeling about attendance upon the devotional services of the congregation, is a sure symptom of declension. Absence from religious services—without providential hindrances—proves a distaste for the ordinances of religion, an evident unconcern about Christian example, a careless indifference about personal piety and church prosperity, and practical abandonment of fellowship with the people of God. Habitual neglect of the appointments of worship is an unmistakable sign of spiritual declension, and if not arrested will result in spiritual disaster.

Habitual neglect of the Lord's Supper is another form of delinquency that prevails in the Church. From all parts and branches of Zion come reports laden with regrets at the widespread delinquency in this part of Christian life. Multitudes have sworn allegiance to Christ, and have promised to "show his death until he comes," who seldom renew their covenant and reaffirm their discipleship at the Holy Supper. It is not now the question whether the observance of the Eucharist is essential to salvation, but it is a serious question of abiding loyalty to Christ. "Do this in remembrance of me" is an order of such emphasis and importance that no true and conscientious believer is at liberty to neglect it. Its observance is a binding obligation upon the disciples of Christ. It is the seal of the believer's covenant with his Saviour, and it is the public profession of his faithfulness until death. A wilful neglect of the sacrament of the altar is a virtual denial of Christ, and whosoever persists in this form of denial will probably be lost.

Another form of delinquency is personal inactivity. A decent moral life, a formal connection with the Church, and a reputable standing in the community, are deemed necessary; and many think that this is all that is required. There is a thoughtless presumption that the Church serves her members as a first-class coach, in which they have taken passage and are passively carried forward, in a style of ease and comfort and safety, to the portals of eternal life. The Church has multitudes on her roll "who have a form of godliness but deny the power thereof." They carry a showy profusion of

leaves but are destitute of fruit. "They have a name that they live, but are dead." They are unproductive, add nothing to the Christian character of the Church, and nothing to her working forces. They exert no positive influence for the advancement of the kingdom of God. They preach neither by precept nor example. They do not "visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and keep themselves unspotted from the world." They take no part in the Sunday School, no interest in devotional exercises, and seem dead to all the vital interests of church life. What a cumbrous freight the Church is dragging along.

Another deplorable delinquency prevails among church members in the work of beneficence. The cause of God is languishing on account of the close and illiberal spirit that abounds among the professed friends of Christ. The benevolent operations of the Church are seriously embarrassed, and the progress of Christ's kingdom is retarded because of the meagreness of benevolent aid. People pray, "thy kingdom come," who do not feel the sacred obligation of helping it to come; whose souls have not been stirred deep enough to realize that praying without working is the sheerest hypocrisy. Amid the reign of financial depression, many men are disposed to bow the cause of God out of their attention on the plea of economy. They betake themselves vigorously to retrenchment as a Christian duty. They grow deeply conscientious about the matter of curtailing expenses, and begin by laying heavy reductions upon benevolent contributions. They may build houses—enlarge their possessions—adorn their homes, live on in extravagant dress and sumptuous fare, and make investments in stocks and deposits in safety banks, but retrenchment is imposed on their voluntary gifts to the cause of God.

Scripture nowhere prescribes how much a Christian man should give; this question is left to his conscience and his God. The Jewish Church was more definite in her requirements, and more binding in the performance of beneficent duty. The Christian Church intrusts this duty and grace more to conscience and the honor of her members. The Saviour

found the practice of giving among the Jews punctual and systematic, and he approved its observance, and took occasion to point out and impress the beauty and grace of giving in his commendation of the poor widow's offering. She put in two mites—all her living. It was not the two mites he commended, but the largeness and sincerity of her benevolent soul. The apostle Paul commanded the Corinthians "Upon the first day of the week let *every one of you* lay by him in store as *God hath prospered him*." Here we have the "divine rule of giving, as well as the duty and spirit of giving. But what amount of delinquents in the Church in reference to beneficence. Many excuse themselves to relieve their consciences. They presume to antagonize the various objects of benevolence; criticise the management of their operations, question the integrity of agents and judicious application of the benefactions. Some form other adroit and silly excuses, as the want of proper information, ignorance of the objects and necessities of benevolence. They read no church papers, and hear nothing from their pulpits—they live in sad and voluntary ignorance.

"That man may last, but never lives,  
Who much receives but nothing gives,  
Whom none can love, whom none can thank,  
Creation's blot, creation's blank."

Beside these delinquencies which are more general, there are others of a graver character that affect the Church more seriously in the eyes of the world—the desecration of the Sabbath day in devoting its sacred hours to visiting or reading secular papers and improper literature: the indulgence in occasional profanity or intoxication: the yielding to temptations of dishonesty and immoral companionships: the patronizing of club-rooms and ball-rooms and social hops and dissipation; and the still more degrading abandonment to debauchery and lewdness and vulgar offences against society and God. These are reproaches of Christian character which admit of no apologies, and require the promptest and most judicious application of church attention and discipline.



These various forms of neglect of duty and transgression of Christian obligation are a reproach to the name and character of the Church, a failure of fulfilling the vows of religious profession, and endanger, the salvation of the delinquents.

WHAT RELATION DOES THE CHURCH BEAR TOWARD THESE  
DELINQUENTS?

The Church still holds a protective relation toward them. They hold a nominal connection, they are not dismissed from their allegiance, nor absolved from their accountability; but they are out of their proper and obedient relation, and have put themselves in an attitude which demands the prompt attentions of the Church. They have wandered from the right way and gone astray, and are exposed to imminent perils. And now the only reformatory influence that will be extended, must come from the Church. The world has no saving power and no possible sympathy for a Christian delinquent. What relation does the shepherd sustain toward a straying sheep? It has strayed from the fold, and is in danger—it is lost, but still a sheep. If it is found and restored, it is worth as much as before. The duty of the shepherd is clear, “he leaves the ninety and nine, and seeks the lost until he find it.” He perseveres, forgets fatigue, and distance, and discomfort, until the lost is found. There is no abatement in his anxiety nor effort until he succeeds. Then he shouts his joys and carries it home. He found his sheep and great is his triumph—he does not drive nor force it back, but in grateful tenderness restores it to the fold and rejoices in the trophy of his effort. The delinquent member has strayed away from duty and from usefulness, is lost to himself and to the Church, and out of obedient and worshipful relation. The mission of the Church is to save her members, to protect her charge, and rescue her imperiled wards. If possible her relation is more responsible for the care and safety of her members and rescuing them from danger, than to sweep the gospel net far and wide to gather the masses of the world. Success in reclaiming delinquents depends much on the spirit and manner of approaching them. Kindness and caution would direct the

shepherd's mission. So a Christian spirit could alone be successful in re-establishing Christian relation with a delinquent. No one would expect to reform broken alliances in a spirit of vengeance. Nothing can be affected in winning souls by frowns and scowls and fulminations of terrible retribution. It requires patience and forbearance, and perseverance, and the administration of tact and sympathy in the sympathy of Christ and in the love of a brother.

#### THE SPIRITUAL OVERSIGHT OF THE CHURCH DUE TO HER MEMBERS.

The duty of members to the Church, and their obligation to contribute to her honor and influence, are undisputed. But the vigilant care and prayerful oversight she owes to her members may sometimes be forgotten. The mission of the Church is to evangelize the world. Her heralds are sent out into the highways and by-ways to call the impenitent and bring them unto the ready banquet of the Gospel. The strongest language is employed to enforce her mission; "Compel them to come in;" "The Spirit and the Bride say come;" The people of God say "come," and influence their fellow-men to abandon their evil ways and bid them "Come with us and we will do you good." The apostle continues the call and exhorts men to "come out from among them and be ye separate saith the Lord." The Church opens her doors and calls in the penitent and believing. They come and are accepted. They are invited to her spiritual bounties and accept. They come in to enjoy the dispensations of the Gospel and the ordinances of worship. They come to find a school to learn, to find an armory from which to draw the necessary weapons of Christian warfare, to find a pleasant and attractive Christian home; to find a nursery for the weak and a hospital for the sick. The Church vouchsafes these spiritual comforts and sympathies and protection to those whom she receives into her communion. It is not too much to say then that the Church owes much to her members. She is expected to exercise a spiritual guardianship over all: encourage them to industry and fidelity in the service of the

Master; prevent delinquency if possible, and engage all members in some sphere of usefulness in the Church.

#### HOW MAY DELINQUENTS BE RECLAIMED?

There are members who will accept no service, take charge of no interest, and contribute nothing to church work. Some will grow inconsistent and discontented and require the constant application of reproof and encouragement and untiring watchfulness. Even then some will lapse into gross delinquency. First of all, the clear and ringing admonitions of the Gospel are required from the pulpit. All remedial influences lie in the light of the Gospel. They are authoritative and solemn and convincing and cannot be gainsaid. From the pulpit must go out the utterances of God's law and man's duty without the fear or favor of man. Let no man become a delinquent through ignorance of his duty.

Secondly, the utterances of the pulpit are not adequate. The thunder of its artillery is an empty sound to the absent delinquent. The preacher in the pulpit is the expounder of truth and duty, but the attentions and tactics of the pastor are essential in dealing with delinquent members. The preacher must be a shepherd as well. The religious training of a congregation is incumbent upon the pastor, as well as preacher, and especially in the work of following up and restoring the delinquent. The pastor knows best how to estimate the value of the soul. He knows best the nature of broken vows; understands best the delinquent's great peril and can better fathom the depth of woe that yawns beneath his wayward feet. His duty is to go out after the delinquent with diligence and perseverance, and find no rest until the lost is found. There hangs an untold burden of responsibility upon the pastor in reference to his proper treatment of delinquent members.

Thirdly, Pastors are not generally unmindful of their duties and responsibilities in regard to this question. They appreciate the value of a consistent and active member of the Church, and also the loss of a member. No effort nor pains are spared by them to restore the erring to their proper place

in the Church. Pastors need the strong and steady support and practical sympathy of the Church Council. The officers of the Church are essentially partners with the pastor in administering the affairs of the Church. Officers are not simply to superintend the temporalities of the Church, but they are to be "ensamples to the flock" of holy living, and spiritual guides in the ways of duty. Members are received into the Church and enfranchised with her privileges and rights, by the action of the Church Council. This official action is more than a mere technical permission to become members of the congregation—it imposes upon spiritual guardianship. They adjudge applicants worthy of communion privileges and of Christian fellowship, and thereby virtually assume towards them the relation of Christian guardianship. The duty binding on Church officers towards members is to encourage them in the right way, to influence them to activity and fidelity, and with the pastor to throw over them the shield of protection from evil, and follow the delinquents step by step with all the winning appliances of kindness and persevering effort to secure their return.

Fourthly, In addition to persuasive influences of the pulpit and the pastor and the Church council, there is a potent influence in the membership of the Church that requires to be exerted. The brotherhood of believers is a sacred and holy union which cannot be broken without causing anxiety and pain. Like members of a family the joys of one reach the hearts of all, and the sorrows of one touch the hearts of all. When one is in distress the house is sad. When one is unfortunate or strays away, there is a thrill of feeling deep and abiding in the soul of all the rest. They will all hasten to the rescue and persevere until successful or until the last ray of hope expires. The strong and sacred ties, that bind members of a Christian congregation in one, should prompt the same deep and abiding anxiety in the heart of all when one goes astray. The inconsistency and unworthiness of one member of a Church should awaken the deepest feelings of concern in all the rest, and rouse up all in the effort to reform and restore for the sake of the delinquent and for the sake

of the Church. If the first steps are watched, the earliest symptoms of declension treated, the majority of delinquents might be spared. Members have opportunities of knowing the tendencies and habits of their associates which neither the pastor nor Church Council can know. And to feel it a duty to correct the indications of remissness might save a soul from danger: and the magnetism and winning force of personal sympathy and kind approaches should prompt all church members to seek and find and save the delinquent.

True it is that there are many incorrigible delinquents, who seem beyond the reach of any influence for good. It is sad how many defy all efforts, and it is equally sad how many Churches never put forth any effort to reclaim the erring. Members drop out of the ranks of daily work—out of the communicant roll, and away from all church attendance, for whom no inquiry is made, and no one cares except the overburdened pastor. Equally true it is that the great majority of delinquents have become so by being neglected or unrecognized by their fellow-members. The unchristian and unreasonable clanishness in congregations has driven many an humble and faithful member away from fellowship and interest in the church. This wrong lies at the door of the church, and calls for the speedy return to Christian sympathy and cordial Church love. The genius and spirit of the Christian Church above all things require the reign of love and personal interest and cordial sympathy in the hearts of members for each other. And this is the potent influence that God will sanctify to the preservation of union of heart and life among the congregations.

To be successful in reclaiming delinquents the members of a church are bound to exercise in these spiritual methods of influence. And the Church must do it. The world will not. No reforming influences come thence. The Church must win the absentees back to their places: the neglecter of the Lord's Supper to its observance—the cold and careless to activity—the worldly-minded and illiberal to the practice of giving: and the outward offenders to repentance and reformation. This is the work of the Church, not of the world.

Erring and undutiful members are not ignorant of the fact of their delinquencies, and from their personal experience and sense of accountability should be easily won back. They must be made to feel the binding nature of their covenant with Christ. They must be made to see the magnitude of the injury they inflict upon the Church, and the aid and comfort they give the enemies of religion. They must see the exposure of their profession to the contempt of the world, and the imperiled condition of their salvation.

The New Testament abounds in counsels and admonitions in regard to delinquents. "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted." Delinquent members are not to be left to themselves, but they are to be restored. They are not to be discarded and neglected or abandoned by the Church. If every one forsakes them the Church dare never be unmindful of her duty. In this state of error they are in extreme danger of being lost. And because of their errors and neglects all the sympathetic agencies of the Church should be called into requisition for their restoration. It is a crisis in their experience which affords her a special opportunity for the application of her remedial agencies.

Delinquents need encouragement. They are estranged from their duty and proper relation to Christ. They feel they are sinners and aliens, but they must remember that they have a great Saviour. Their manhood must be addressed and made to comprehend their possibilities through grace. They are not hopeless culprits, but wanderers from God and on the road to ruin. To them God says "as I live, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O! house of Israel."

Let the Church exercise a vigilant care over all her members and prevent any of them from delinquency, if possible: look faithfully after the neglecters of worship and the absentees from the Lord's Supper. Hold up constantly before the careless and inactive the claims of Christ upon their services

and press upon the illiberal that giving is a grace as well as prayer and worship. And, "Brethren if any of you," or any of your members, "do err from the truth and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins."

The question of vigorous church discipline is involved and meets with different views. Church discipline is doubtless a necessity. The most active and prosperous congregations are found under the rule of careful discipline. As an educational measure judicious discipline is highly salutary—but as a penitential measure it is of doubtful expediency except in extreme cases, where the Church rather than the delinquent is to be considered. The safety of society demands the punishment of a criminal, so the safety and character of the Church sometimes demands the suspension or excommunication of an offender. But a hasty and ill-advised subjection to severe discipline is ineffectual and mischievous. Leniency and forbearance with the erring is more in accord with the spirit of the Master, who is graciously indulgent and patient with us, and is attended with greater probabilities of winning the offender to reformation and salvation.

The return of delinquents to their allegiance requires cautious but cordial attention. Give them the strongest proof of your confidence, and convince them of being cordially welcome. Give them full share of your sympathy and trust. Place into their hands such work as they are capable to manage. Interest begets interest and love begets love. Give them something to do. This is an important feature in church life. All need some responsible work. Appoint them on committees; associate them with active and faithful members, so that the affections of their souls strike deep root in abiding devotion to Christ and His cause.

## ARTICLE VI.

## ADAM.

\* Translated from the German of Dean Buchrucker, of Munich, by  
Rev. G. F. BEHRINGER, Indianapolis, Ind.

Adam (אָדָם, *ʾAdām*, Adamus, Adami, or Adam, Adae), equivalent to man, is the name of the first human being—a name given to him by God himself. \* \* \* “In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them and called their name Adam,” \* \* \* Gen. 5 : 1, 2. But Adam’s significance is not recognized, if he be considered merely as the foremost, similar being of the long line of his descendants, that is, simply as an individual. According to the Biblical account, he appears first of all as the end-object of the material world, in that its whole development was aimed at him. In progressive steps creation ascends unto him. At first the world is formed; after that, it is filled. The vegetable kingdom forms the conclusion of the first three days; man is the end of the whole creation. In it we find everywhere indications pointing to the coming of man, until he himself appears, the gathering together, as it were, of all these (Microcosm). As such he belongs, on the one hand, to this creature world as a constituent part: he is made dust of the earth (עָפָר אֲדָמָה). On the other hand, he must for this very reason rise far above the same. For whilst it is said of the other creatures: “And God said, Let the earth bring forth,” we read of the creation of man that God in his behalf had conceived a special purpose, and that he created him “in his own image.” What this is intended to convey cannot be gathered from an analysis of, or a distinction between עֶלְמָא and דְּמִוּתָא (image and likeness), but rather on

\* From “Herzog’s Real-Encyclopædie,” Vol. I., p. 138—40, 2nd Ed.



the one part, from the end appointed unto man (Gen. 1 : 26), and on the other part, from the manner in which he was quickened and inspired (Gen. 2 : 7). That end the Holy Scriptures declare to be his dominion over the earth ; and concerning the quickening we are informed, that it happened through God's breathing into him "the breath of life, and man became a living soul." But even if in the expression, "a living soul," the specific difference between man and animal be not given, yet it is contained in the statement that it was God who directly breathed it (the soul) into him. God is freedom, the absolute personality ; in the world reigns necessity. God's image is reflected in man in this, that man is a conscious Ego, a free personality, and moreover in a direct relation to God. Thus he is enabled to take possession of the earth and to keep it in harmonious unity with the Creator. In Adam, therefore, the being of man is presented to us in his God-appointed peculiarity : he is the unity of the Ego and of nature, in the intermediate position between God and the world. In this sense he is the end of creation, marked by creation's Sabbath.

We are still Ego and nature ; but Adam was this in harmonious unity, as representative of mankind, as mankind in person. It is of the highest importance and significance that man should have been created as a personal unit, in contradistinction to the animal life of the species ; for thus God and man are related to each other as person to person, the absolute and creative personality in personal relation with and over against man, which is the real foundation of the whole history of redemption. Therewith is necessarily understood that in Adam originally there existed no distinction of the sexes. He was not man (i. e. a male-being), much less man-woman (a hermaphrodite), but rather *the* man, as God designed him. And yet he did not become the representative of mankind in actual reality, until he became husband of the woman (who was taken out of him), the progenitor or head of our race. In what relation, however, he stands to the generations that have proceeded from him, according to the Biblical view, is first fully seen in the aim and object of the

history of redemption, in Christ, as the *second* Adam. \* \* "because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead," (2 Cor. 5 : 14).

The significant comparison between Adam and Christ is found in Rom. 5 : 12 seq., and 1 Cor. 15 : 21, 22 ; 45—49. In the first passage is developed the idea, how that through Adam, in consequence of his transgression, sin and death entered into the world ; how this death from him passed over all men ; and how this death reigns over all, without and before meriting the same through their own personal transgression. Yea, even more than this : condemnation (*τό κριμα εἰς το κατάκριμα*) likewise from Adam has passed over all men ; which, conceived in its entire extent is consummated in death. Over against this reality, righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) justification (*δικαίωσις*), and life, proceed from Christ, the second Adam, unto whose power the individuals are subject whilst on earth, without first being able to merit the same through personal service—but with the difference in the measure or extent of the resultant activity. Just as here (in Romans), sin and righteousness, death and life are compared, so in the passage in Corinthians, Death and Resurrection, in which the life secured to us in Christ is fully revealed. But, the many sinners condemned to death, as well as the many righteous children of life, are always considered under the personal unity of one representative head, through whose determining act their condition is decided. In what manner the personal freedom of the individual is thereunto related, is not here to be furthermore considered. For present consideration it suffices, that in and with Adam's transgression, the sin, guilt, and death of the human race were established ; so that Adam was not merely the first man, but truly and really the representative head of the race.

Adam died 930 years of age, the father of sons and daughters (Gen. 5 : 3, 4).

Concerning the being of man as a free Ego, there has been no difference of opinion in theology. Pure Pantheism alone lowers the personality of man to a degree of self-consciousness, which must be overcome by him in order to be resolved

into the self-conscious universal.\* Materialism regards man entirely as a product of nature, a subject of pure, natural necessity, even denying in him the existence of the soul. It knows of nothing but force and matter, notwithstanding that the marvel of self-consciousness can not be explained in this manner. But in this way the unity of the human race is annulled; for even if Vogt and Darwin derive everything from the primitive cell, they nevertheless assume the origin of the race from a number of primal pairs.

Theology firmly maintains the freedom of man. But as to the relation of Adam to the generations springing from him, different opinions were entertained at an early day. The earliest Greek Church Fathers do not express themselves upon the connection between the head of the race and his descendants. Irenaeus was the first who regarded the primal transgression as the joint act of the race. Origen, on the contrary, perceives in Adam's transgression no such determining act of the race. He regards man as sinful, because he determined himself for sin through an abuse of his freedom whilst in a certain pre-existent state. The bodies only of all who are descended from Adam are to be germinally conditioned in him.† The Church Fathers Gregory Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom, who otherwise occupy the same ground with Origen, trace sin back to the historical fall of Adam. But above all others Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine, represent the Biblical standpoint. Ambrose most firmly characterizes the relation of Adam to the human race: "We have all sinned in the first man."‡ Pelagius, on the other hand, weakens this intimate relation. He beholds in Adam's sin merely a bad example to his descendants. Adam is but the first at the head of many; he regards him simply as an individual. Semi-Pelagianism (Cassian) occupies the same standpoint. It considers

---

\*Vide Delitzsch, *Apolog.*, p. 49.

†Origines: *Contra Celsum* IV., p. 534.—Kahn: *Dogmatik* II., p. 107. 108.

‡*Omnes in primo homine peccavimus.*—Apol. Dav.

the first transgression as the occasion and beginning of universal evil.

The Council of Aransio (Orange: 529 A. D.) returned to the Augustinian view. The Augustinian teaching, that mankind was latent in Adam, was generally entertained during the whole period of the Middle Ages. The Reformation period, likewise, which saw in the Semi-Pelagian system the root of all self-righteousness, returned to the teachings of Augustine on original sin, and reassigned to Adam the position which he occupies in the Scriptures. In Adam the whole race sinned; mankind was a fellow-subject with Adam in the first sin. "Adam is regarded as the common parent, source, and representative of the human race."\* There Adam is everywhere the personality who carries within himself the species (race). The position of Rationalism, in its view of Adam, is characterized by the above remarks on Pelagianism: the standpoint of modern Speculative Philosophy, beginning with Fichte, by the comments upon Pantheism. Schleiermacher's opinion is indicated by the following passage: "We place in the stead of the relation of the first man to all his successors, the more general relation of each preceding to each succeeding generation, and say that everywhere the active sin of the former is the causative original sin of the latter."† It remains yet to be stated that Theosophy, since the time of Scotus Erigena, regards the primitive man as living originally in a glorified body.

\**Adamus ut communis parens, stirps et repraesentator generis humani spectatur.*—Hollaz. Vide Kahnis: *Dogmatik* III., p. 302.

†*Glaubenslehre* II., p. 66.

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE SCRIBES BEFORE AND IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.

By the Rev. B. PICK, Ph. D., Rochester, N. Y.

The literary activity of the men, so often mentioned in the Gospels, comprises the time from 458 B. C. to 70 A. D., *i. e.* from the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity to the destruction of Jerusalem.

## A. THE SOPHERIM. 458 B. C.—200 B. C.

After the return, Ezra attempted to restore the Jewish polity to its former state, but he found his countrymen much neglected and ignorant. It was therefore his first care, to collect the different books of the O. T., to clear them of any error which might have crept into the text, and to cause them to be read and expounded to the people. In order to carry out these needful measures, he associated with himself a body of one hundred and twenty men, learned in the law (*סופרים*), the "*Sopherim* or *Scribes*," and which body is known in history as that of "the men of the Great Synagogue." Under the administration of the "*Sopherim*," the traditions increased in number and authority (*παράδοσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, Matt. 15 : 2; Mark 7 : 3; *πατρικαὶ παραδόσεις*, Gal. 1 : 14), hence numerous purely ceremonial ordinances could afterwards be traced to this period. A few of them are ascribed to Ezra himself (*Baba Kama* 82*a*), although their character scarcely bears out these pretensions. A more important part of the functions of the Great Synagogue was that which concerned the arrangement, division, and interpretation of the sacred text. We are told that the *Sopherim* arranged the Old Testament into three classes, the *Torah*, *Nebiyim* and *Kethubim* (*נְבִיאִים תּוֹרָה וְכִתּוּבִים*)\* according

\* To the Torah, or law, belonged the Pentateuch; to the Nebiyim, Vol. VIII. No. 2.

as certain portions were to be publicly read and interpreted, or only to be read, or in some cases to be wholly omitted in public reading. The duties connected with this reading and exposition of the Scriptures naturally devolved upon the more learned, who appear to have been regularly set apart for this purpose, and on stated days to have lectured in the various synagogues. "As the reader had mostly to translate the original text into the dialect of the people, to which they probably often added a brief exposition, the religious education of the people was almost entirely committed to them. The influence which they thus gained, the fact that from the paucity of books and the general ignorance, the people depended *entirely* on this religious aristocracy, together with the growing tendencies of the age in that direction, contributed not a little to place religious eminence in mere knowledge and outward observances, without spiritual experience or love. It also laid the foundation of the exaggerated notions which both teachers and taught afterwards formed of the dignity of the Rabbi or teacher"\*.

or Prophets, were reckoned the former prophets נביאים ראשונים viz. Joshua, Judges, the books of Samuel, and of the Kings, and the latter prophets נביאים אחרונים viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the minor prophets: and to the Kethubim, or Hagiographa, belonged all the rest of the Holy Scriptures, including also Daniel. That this order of the canon was the same in the time of Christ, can be seen from the fact, that in Luke 24 : 44, He speaks of *ο νόμος Μωσέως, οί προφηται και ο ψαλμοι*. From the fact of our Lord speaking of the Psalms as the third division of the O. T., it would appear that the book of Psalms stood first on the list of THAT DIVISION,—thus gave its name to all the remaining books, or Hagiographa, as this section of the sacred writings has been called. As the Psalms stood FIRST on the list of the third division of the O. T., so the book of Chronicles appears to have stood LAST among the Hagiographa; that this book closed this division, and hence the entire O. T., is evident from our Saviour's words, in which he sums up the bloodshedding of martyr-prophets from the foundation of the world, to the last martyrdom recorded in the canonical books of the Jews, viz. "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple," (Luke 41, 50, 51; Matt. 23 : 35; 2 Chron. 24 : 20).

\* Edersheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation, p. 114.

Ordinarily, the various congregations met on Sabbaths, on Mondays, and Thursdays; on the latter occasions for the adjudication of causes according to the law of Moses, as well as for the reading and interpretation of the Bible. These teachers have generally left behind them one or more theological commonplaces, which are chiefly valuable as indicating the bearing of their theology and the direction of their teaching. They were afterwards collected into one of the treatises of which the Mishna or "traditional law\* is composed, and which bears the name of "Pirke Aboth," or sayings of the Fathers. One of the most celebrated of the "men of the Great Synagogue," was the high priest, *Simon the Just* (שִׁמְעוֹן הַצַּדִּיק) ὁ δίκαιος ἐπικληθεὶς διὰ τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβὲς καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους εὖνουν, Jos. Antiq., xii., 2, 4), a man revered for his sanctity and true patriotism. As we are told in the Pirke Aboth, Simon was the last surviving member of the Great Synagogue (בְּשִׁירֵי כְנֶסֶת הַגְּדוֹלָה) and lived probably between 300—200 B. C. His motto was: "The world subsists upon three things: upon the law, upon the ministry and upon acts of mercy."† That he was held in great honor, we see from the expression in the magnificent eulogy of Ben Sira, the writer of Ecclesiasticus, who in recounting the services which Simon had rendered to the temple and city of Jerusalem, proceeds in these admirable words: "How beauteous was he when coming forth from the temple, he appeared from within the veil. He shone in his days as the morning star in the midst of a cloud and as the moon at the full. And as the sun when it shineth, so did he shine in the temple of God. And as the rainbow giving light in the bright clouds, and as the flower of roses in the days of spring, and as the lilies that are on the brink of the water, and as the sweet smelling frankincense in the time of summer. As a bright fire, and frankincense burning in the fire. As a

\* Comp. our Art. the TALMUD, in the *Baptist Quarterly*, 1876, p. 66, sq.

† This sentiment sufficiently indicates that Simon belonged to the Pharisaical party.

massy vessel of gold, adorned with every precious stone. As an olive tree budding forth, and a cypress tree rearing itself on high, when he put on the robe of glory, and was clothed with the perfection of power," (ch. 50 : 5—12).

B. EARLIER TANAIM. B. C. 200—70 A. D.

With Simon's successor a new era commenced, that of the Tanaïm or Teachers of the Law.\* The chief aim of these men was—1, to fix and formularize the views and expositions of their predecessors, the Sopherim, and to pass them as laws. Thus fixed and established, these views were termed *Halachoth* (הלכות)—law. They are composed in Hebrew and expressed in laconic and often enigmatical formulæ. The formularizing of these *Halachoth* was especially needed, since the successive ascendancy of the Persians, Egyptians, Syrians and Romans over Palestine, greatly influenced the habits and conduct of the Jewish people, and since the Sopherim themselves, did not set forth their opinions as final. The relation which the work of the *Tanaïm* or the *ρομοδιδάσκαλοι* in this department bears to that of the Sopherim will be better understood by an example. The Sopherim deduced from the words "*when thou liest down and when thou risest up*" (ובקומך בשכבך, Deut. 6 : 7), that it is the duty of every Israelite to repeat both morning and evening the sections of the law (i. e. Deut. 6 : 4—9 ; 11 : 13—21), which proclaim the unity of God, without specifying the hours during which the passages are to be recited. Whilst the *ρομοδιδάσκαλοι*, accepting this deduction of the Sopherim as law (הלכה), fixed the time, when this declaration about the unity of God is to be made

\* The appellation TANAIM is Aramaic (תנאים, sing. תנאי, frequentative of the Chaldee תנה=Hebrew שנה, to REPEAT), and literally denotes REPEATERS OF THE LAW or TEACHERS OF THE LAW. In the N. Test. they are denominated *ρομοδιδάσκαλοι* (Luke 5 : 17; Acts 5 : 34). In later times they are called RABBANAN (רבנן)=our teacher, RABBANI (Ραββουνι, Mark 10 : 51; John 22 : 16), RABBOH and RABBI=μαθητή (Matth. 23 : 7).



by every Israelite, without mentioning the length of the section to be recited, or that it is a duty to do so, because they founded it upon the interpretation of the *Sopherim* (*Mishna Berachoth*, 1: 1—5. 2. The Tanaim compile exegetical rules (*Mדות*), to show how these opinions of the *Sopherim*, as well as the expansion of these views by doctors of the law, are to be deduced from the Scriptures. 3. They developed the ritual and judicial questions hinted at in the Pentateuch in accordance with the requirements of the time and the ever-changing circumstances of the nation. As the period over which the work of these teachers of the law extended was very long, and as the older doctors of this period expressed their definitions of the *Halachoth* in extremely concise and sometimes in obscure formulæ, many of these *Halachoth*, like the Scriptures, needed further elucidation, and became the object of study and discussion among the *later Tanaim*. These discussions, as well as the different modes of exposition, whereby the sundry *Halachoth* were connected with the Bible, which reflect the mental characteristics and idiosyncrasies of the particular teachers and schools, were gradually collected and rubricated, and now constitute the contents of the *Mishna* (cf. our Art. on the *Talmud*) and the commentaries on the Pentateuch entitled *Mechilta*,\* *Siphra*,† and *Siphri*.‡

The first of these earlier Tanaim is *Antigonus of Socho* (about 200—170 B. C.). He was a disciple of Simon and the first who bears a Greek name. "He probably belonged to the Grecian party, which by an imitation of Grecian practices,

\*MECHILTA מְכִילְתָּא, the oldest commentary on Exodus, first published at Constantinople, 1515. A critical edition was published by J. H. Weiss, Vienna, 1860, but the latest ed. is that of M. Friedmann, ib., 1870. A Latin transl. is given in Ugolino's *Thesaur. Antiq. Sacr.*, Vol. xiv.

†SIPHRA סִפְרָא, a commentary on Leviticus, published with a commentary by M. L. Malbim, Bucharest, 1860. Another ed. is that by J. H. Weise, Vienna, 1862; transl. into Latin in Ugolino's *Thesaurus*, vol. xiv.

\*SIPHRI סִפְרֵי on Numbers and Deuteronomy, latest ed. by M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1864; Latin transl. in Ugolino's *Thesaurus*, vol. xv.

sought to bring about an intimate union with those foreign masters of Palestine who were objects of pious abhorrence to the Pharisees. It is to this tendency that the sect of the Sadducees which traces its origin to the successors of Antigonus owes its origin. Unlike the Pharisees, the Sadducees were primarily a political and only secondarily a religious party. Their theology, which is rather negative than positive, was modified in accordance with their political aspirations." The motto of Antigonus, which fully accords with this view, was: "Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of a reward, but imitate servants who serve their master without looking for a reward, and let the fear of Heaven be upon you." \*

About this time the terrible persecutions of the Syrians, who sought to force Grecian culture and idolatry upon the Jews, led to the popular rising of the Maccabees. The independence of Israel was secured for a time, and the Maccabees ascended the Jewish throne as the *Asmonean* princes. During this time the activity of the men of the great Synagogue was necessarily interrupted, and when we meet again with a supreme Jewish council, it re-appears (about 172 B. C.) under the name of *Sanhedrim* under the auspices of the Asmoneans. During the time which intervened between Antigonus' death and the establishment of the Sanhedrim, Zadoc and Bööthus, his disciples, probably directed the theology of their time. It is said that a perversion of the principles of their teacher Antigonus, led them to found the sect of the Sadducees. Thus the treatise *Aboth* of R'Nathan, ch. 5, states: "Antigonus had two disciples, named Zadoc and Bööthus. These heard the words of their master, but understood them not; therefore they said 'shall a laborer work all day, and not receive his wages in the evening? Surely if there were any reward or future state after death, or if the dead were ever

---

\* *Aboth* 1, 3. Pressensé in his "Jesus Christ: his Times, Life and work," (Am. ed. 1868 p. 68 sq.) calls this maxim a "noble and almost evangelical one, a most beautiful maxim, and one denoting a legitimate reaction from the legal formalism which was in process of development."

to rise again, our teacher would not have directed us to expect no reward.' Accordingly, they collected disciples and founded the sect of the Sadducees or Böothusees, whose doctrine was that the soul perisheth with the body, and that there is no resurrection of the dead, nor angels, nor spirits." It is impossible, however, to determine whether these Rabbins were really at the head of the Grecian party, which, as a religious sect bore the name of Sadducees; or whether at a later period, the sect in question had, from a desire to trace their principles to the earlier Tanaïm claimed these Rabbins as the first propounders of their principles.

We have already stated that the men of the great Synagogue were succeeded by a Jewish tribunal known as the Sanhedrim (*συνέδριον*, סנהדרין). The somewhat indefinite ac-

counts of their spiritual activity become more distinct as we approach the period of the Saviour's advent. The Sanhedrim was the supreme court, and decided as the last instance in all juridical and theological questions. It consisted of seventy-one members (Sanhed. 1: 6), with two clerks.

The meeting-place was in the *Hall of Squares* (לִישַׁכַּת הַמִּנִּיחַ), until forty years before the destruction of the temple [i. e. while the Saviour was teaching in Palestine], the sessions were removed from the Hall of the Squares to the Halls of Purchase, (*Sabbath 15 a, Aboda Sara, 8 b*), on the east side of the temple mount. The members of the Sanhedrim were not professional men in the sense of devoting their whole time to their peculiar avocation, or deriving their livelihood from it. In fact, they were engaged at various trades on which they entirely depended for support, with the exception of a small compensation made from the temple-treasury for any loss of time. Their ordinary avocations appeared so much the less incongruous with their duties in the Sanhedrim, as in general every truly devoted or Pharisaical Jew, was, according to the current notions of the time, expected chiefly to devote himself to theological studies, and to follow his worldly calling only in order to support himself, or to minis-

ter to other students of the law. Hence, as the honor of being a member of the Sanhedrim was not reserved for the priestly order (although a considerable portion of its members probably belonged to it), so the members of any trade, except those which were supposed to be degrading, or to have a tendency to harden, might aspire to this distinction. The members of the Sanhedrim were chosen for life, and regularly ordained by the imposition of hands *סְמִיָּכָה* (*Sanhedr.* 4: 4).

Every description of their arrangements and order of procedure necessarily dates from a later period, although it was probably substantially the same at all times. The members sat in a semi-circle (*גורן עגולה כהצ'י*) with the *Nasi* (*נָשִׂיא*=*prince*) or president in the middle, and the *Ab-beth-din* (*אב בית דין*) or vice-president at his right, and *Chacham* (*חכם* wise man, perhaps the head of the theological department) at his left. The other members occupied places according to their rank in the college, so that the fourth, the sixth, etc., in dignity, sat to the *Nasi*'s right hand, and the fifth, seventh, etc., to his left. Twenty-three members were necessary to make a quorum. Opposite to the Judges, in twenty-three rows (each row containing twenty-three) sat the students, arranged according to their merit. Another body of hearers were ranged all around the hall. There were thus two orders, the members of which expected promotion. The hearers might be elevated to the rank of regular students, and the students might advance from row to row, and finally become members either of any of the provincial colleges, or of the Sanhedrim itself. Vacancies in the latter were filled up by the promotion of members of provincial colleges, or by that of distinguished students. In order to understand the position of the Sanhedrim, and its relation to other colleges, it is necessary to recall certain general principles.

The Jewish state was meant to be a theocracy, and the spiritual and secular administration in it were in reality not separated. The authorities of the synagogue were at the

same time the ministers of justice. Thus every considerable synagogue had its Sanhedrim, or College of Justice, consisting of twenty-three ordained members, who were entitled to pronounce sentence even in capital cases. The smaller synagogues, or those in towns with fewer than one hundred and twenty heads of families and ten synagogue officials, possessed an inferior College of Justice, which consisted of three members, who were only allowed to adjudicate on civil cases. From the College of three, an appeal might be taken to the nearest College of twenty-three, and from the latter to the lowest of the three Sanhedrims of twenty-three in Jerusalem, (said to have been in connection with as many synagogues in that city), and so on till the case reached the great Sanhedrim, which must be viewed as the College connected with the Temple. The priests seem to have had a College of their own, which decided on all matters purely relating to them, or the temple police.

If certain judicial duties devolved on the members of the various Colleges throughout the land, it was theirs also to provide for the spiritual instruction and edification of the people. Hence, on Sabbaths and feast-days, lectures were delivered in the synagogues, and at a later period in the various school houses also, at which all were invited to attend. Men and women sat separately, and listened respectfully to the lecture of the presiding rabbi, to the *chacham* (חכם, *i. e.*, wise man), or *darshan* (דרשן, *i. e.*, preacher), as he was designated. But in case the preacher should use language too abstruse, or fail to adapt himself to the weaker capacities of his hearers, an arrangement was made by which the preacher communicated his discourse in a low tone to an "interpreter" (the *meturgeman*), or "speaker" (*Emora*), who in turn rehearsed it to the audience in a plain and popular form.\*

After these few explanatory remarks, we turn to the history of the Sanhedrim. The first president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim were *Joses ben Joeser* from Zereda, and

---

\* Cf. Edersheim, l. c.  
Vol. VIII. No. 2.

*Joseph ben Jochanan* from Jerusalem. They flourished from about 170—140 B. C. Little is known of their peculiar teaching. Their fundamental principles are somewhat vague, but point in the direction of increasing rabbinical influence and pretensions. The first said, "let thy house be a meeting place for the wise; dust thyself with the dust of their feet and eagerly drink in their words," (*Pirke Aboth*, 1 : 3). In the Maccabean struggles, *Joses* played an important part, and was one of the priests who were slain by *Bacchides* through the treachery of *Aleimus*, (1 Macc. 2 : 42; 7 : 12—16). The second said, "let thy house be wide open, and let the poor be the children of thy house. Do not multiply speech with a woman. If this applies to one's own wife, how much more to that of another man? Hence the sages say, that the man who multiplies speech with a woman bringeth evil upon himself, swerves from the words of the law, and will finally inherit destruction," (*Aboth* 1 : 5). Both were held in great esteem, and, at their decease, it was said, "those in whom every excellency was found, had now departed," (*Sota* 14 : 9).

To them succeeded *Jehoshua ben Perachia*, as president, and *Nithai* of *Arbela* as vice-president, from 140—110 B. C. Their administration fell in troublous times. The throne and priestly office were conjointly occupied by *Jochanan ben Simon*, *ben Mattathias*, commonly called *John Hyrcanus* (B. C. 135—106), who, justly or unjustly, was supposed by the Pharisees to have been derived from a mother who at one time had been a captive. In their view, this incapacitated him for being high-priest. Whether this was a pretence to hide their general opposition or not, their enmity soon manifested itself. The king having returned from a glorious victory, and being pleased with the condition of the people at home, gave a banquet, to which he invited both Pharisees and Sadducees. As he was enjoying himself in the midst of his guests, he, instigated by the Sadducees, asked the Pharisees to tell him whether there was any command which he had transgressed, that he might make amends, since it was his great desire to make the law of God his rule of life. To this one of the Pharisees replied: "Let Hyrcanus be satisfied

with the regal crown and give the priestly diadem to some more worthy of it, because before his birth his mother was taken captive from the Maccabean home, in a raid of the Syrians upon Modin, and it is illegal for the son of a captive to officiate as a priest, much more as a high-priest." The Sadducees, who had thus far succeeded, tried to persuade Hyrcanus that the Pharisees did this designedly, in order to lower him in the eyes of people. To ascertain it, Hyrcanus demanded of the Sanhedrim to sentence the offender to capital punishment. But the Pharasaic doctors of the law, who had no special enactment against indignities heaped upon a sovereign, who believed and taught that all men are alike in the sight of God, and whose very president at this time propounded the maxim of leniency,\* said that according to the law they could only give him forty stripes save one, which was the regular punishment for slanderers. It was this which made Hyrcanus go over to the Sadducees, massacre many of the Scribes, and fill the Sanhedrim with Sadducees. (Comp. Joseph. Antiqq., xiii., 10 : 5, 6). In the persecution which now ensued, the leading Pharisees fell victims. The president of the Sanhedrim, Jehoshua, managed however to escape to Egypt. Hyrcanus was succeeded in the government by Judas Aristobulus, and, after the brief reign of that prince, by Alexander Jannai. The latter also belonged to the Sadducees. This circumstance, together with the despotism of his reign, and the many sanguinary wars in which he engaged, rendered his administration more than ordinarily popular. The feeling of the masses displayed itself unmistakably, when, on the feast of tabernacles, while the king as high-priest was preparing to sacrifice, the worshipers threw at him the pomegranites, which at that feast they always carried in their hands. The king's subordinates commenced at once to quarrel with the Rabbis, because they had attempted to weaken the honor and authority of the king

\* "Have a teacher procure an associate, and view the acts of others in as favorable a light as possible," (Aboth 1 : 6). His colleague's maxim was : "Keep aloof from a wicked neighbor, have no fellowship with sinners, and reject not the belief in retribution," (ibid. v. 7).



and of the high-priest. While this was going on, one of the disaffected rabbis approached the king rudely, crying as he came, "Woe to thee, thou son of a profane woman! What art thou doing? How canst thou dare to meddle with the priesthood? Thy mother (meaning his grand-mother, mother of Hyrcanus), was a profane woman, and thou art not fit to be high-priest. Startled and alarmed at the assault, and perhaps expecting to be attacked murderously by those around, he shouted, "The sword! The sword upon the wise men!" (חֶרֶב חֶרֶב עַל חֲכָמִים). The order was obeyed with such fury, that six thousand of the people were slain on the spot, and the survivors dispersed and fled from Jerusalem. Only one rabbi, Simon ben Shetach, the brother-in-law of Alexander, escaped to Egypt, where he joined his former teacher Jehoshua ben Perachia.\* Through the influence of his sis-

---

\* By a strange anachronism some Jewish authorities declare the Ex-Nasi Jehoshua to have been the teacher of Jesus of Nazareth, pretending that he fled with him into Egypt, and which, as a modern Jewish writer of a life of Jesus says, "THE RABBI DID NOT NOTICE IN THE GREAT CONFUSION AND CONSTERNATION!!! The writer, to whom we have alluded, Mr. Isaac Goldstein, gives us in his *JESUS OF NAZARETH*, "an Authentic Ancient Tale," (New York, 1866), the following historical (sic!) description of what took place in Egypt between Jehoshua and Jesus. On p. 103 our admirable writer states: "Rabbi Jehoshua ben Perachia, with his disciples, left Alexandria for Jerusalem. On the road he stopped at a house kept by a woman noted for her kindness and her piety, and she paid every attention and mark of respect to the Rabbi and his followers, and when they took their departure, the Rabbi said, 'Beauty dwells in this house. God shall bless thee in all thy undertakings. Mayest thou be like a fruitful vine by the side of thy husband; thy husband shall praise thee, and thy sons shall grow up a pride and honor to thee. Whoever shall see thee shall say: 'Hail unto thee! hail unto thee!' When Jesus heard the blessing of his Rabbi, he laughed, and said, 'Rabbi, the woman has sore eyes, and is anything but neat in appearance, therefore she cannot possess beauty; and pray of what can she be proud? or for what can she be praised?' The Rabbi looked eagerly around, and seeing that it was Jesus who had spoken, said, 'Leave us; leave us at once, treacherous and ungodly man. Dost thou suppose that I spoke of bodily beauty? We wish thee not in our company. Depart and annoy us no more.' Jesus departed, but some time after returned, and



ter, the queen, Simon was soon recalled, and now exerted himself to remodel the Sanhedrim, which had in the interval re-assembled, but now consisted almost entirely of Sadducees, and ignorant persons, whose sole claim to distinction was their political support of the king. Simeon's plan for expelling these persons deserves mention, both for its success, and as in itself an important step in the development of Rabbinism. He first trained a number of students, and being thus prepared to substitute orthodox Rabbins for the old members of the Sanhedrim, he prevailed upon that body to resolve that in future every theological or juridical discussion should be supported by an appeal either to Scripture or to tradition. An occasion soon offered for putting this resolution in force. Whether by pre-arrangement or accidentally, the king and queen honored the Sanhedrim with their presence. As usual, questions were proposed and answered by the Sadducees in a sense contrary to the written and the oral law. Simon insisted on the requisite proofs. One of the senators promised, indeed, to bring them forward at the next

---

begged the Rabbi to re-admit him to his college, but the Rabbi sternly refused, and one day when he was engaged in prayer and the profession, *Shema Israel* (*Hear, O Israel*), he again appeared before him, and the Rabbi made signs to him to repent, but Jesus did not understand him; he thought, the Rabbi does not wish to accept me; I can see that I am an outcast, an unworthy candidate in his estimation, and it is evident they will receive me no more. And why should I yield to gloomy thoughts and fancies? It is time for me to carry out my designs openly. Their voices I shall not fear, and their multitude cannot overthrow me. I shall venture, let the consequences be what they may.'

With this resolve Jesus turned away, and erected an altar, stone on top of another stone, and at once commenced practicing his witchcraft: and many were induced to turn from the old law and believe in him.

When Rabbi Jehoshua heard this, he sent word to him, saying, 'Desist, repent, wash thyself in the waters of purity, return from thy evil ways. If I have in a moment of anger refused thee, I can again reconsider my resolve, and admit thee.' Jesus sent word back, saying: 'I have learned from thee this doctrine. Whoever sinneth and causeth others to sin, can never repent nor be forgiven.' "*Sapienti sat!!!*"

sederunt, but being unable to do so, he felt obliged to resign. His place was filled by one of Simeon's adherents. Only the old Nasi, *Judas ben Tabbai*, a man of good intentions, conscientious to scrupulosity, but weak and wholly under the guidance of Simeon, was retained. Simeon had now become vice-president.\* They flourished from 110—65 B. C., but which of the two was the president, is a matter of dispute. The fact is that Ben Tabbai, though a well-meaning and virtuous man, proved himself to be incompetent to his office, and was induced to resign it. His motto was: "Be not like the orderers of judges (probably the procurators or governors). When parties are before thee, treat them as if they were innocent," (*Aboth* 1 : 8). As for Simeon Ben Shetach, whose maxim was: "Be extremely careful in examining witnesses, and beware lest from thy mode of questioning they should learn how to give false testimony" (*ib.*, v. 9), he was a man of inflexible rigor, a high-minded ecclesiastic, sensitive withal, thought it no sin to refuse forgiveness to an adversary, and was ever on the alert to magnify his office. One anecdote remains to illustrate his character, and to show that he had given his royal brother-in-law great offence before the flight to Alexandria. In the Talmud (*Sanhedrim* tract. *כהן גדול*) we read the following: "One of the king's servants had committed a murder, and then absconded. The king, as master of the fugitive, was summoned to answer for his servant, and, as master did honor to the law by coming. As king, he remembered his dignity, and sat down in court, Ben Shetach being judge. "Stand up, king Jaunai!" shouted this haughty judge, "stand up upon thy feet, while they bear witness concerning thee. For thou dost not stand before us, but before Him, who spake, and the world was. \* \*

---

\*His first step was to procure, through the queen, a pardon for his former teacher and friend, Joshua, who was still in Egypt. He communicated to him the intelligence of his liberation from exile in the following enigmatical epistle: "From one Jerusalem, the holy city, to thee, Alexandria, in Egypt. My husband lives in the midst of thee, and I mourn desolate and lonely." Joshua readily understood the purport of this message, and immediately returned to Jerusalem.

The divine displeasure was so signally manifested in consequence, that a law was enacted to this effect: "The king neither judges, nor is he judged," (ibid. 2 : 1). Of Simeon the Talmud also records, that on one occasion he sentenced and executed eighty women convicted of withcraft. Two of the relatives of these women conspired together to obtain full revenge on the rigorous judge. They accused the only son of Simon of a capital crime; and so skillfully had they planned their charge and framed their evidence, that the innocent youth was convicted, and the wretched father compelled to pass sentence of death upon him. When the young man was led forth for execution, the false accusers relented, and came forward to declare that they had committed perjury, and that the convict was innocent. But the law forbade the re-opening of closed testimony, and though Simon's fatherly feelings for a moment made him hesitate about the propriety of the execution, yet his son, to uphold the dignity of the law, exclaimed to him, "Father, if thou wishest that salvation should come to Israel through thee, pay no regard to my life! and accordingly the son died a martyr to the honor of the law, (*Sanhedrim* 1 : 5 ; 7 : 3). No wonder that tradition celebrates Simon b. Shetach as "the restorer of the divine law to its pristine glory."

With the vicissitudes of those troubled times the Sanhedrim was subject to alternate changes, now omnipotent, and now depressed to the verge of ruin. Involved as was its existence with the politics of the day, it will be necessary to take a glance at the course of events which form the history of the Jews at that period. Hyrcanus had left five sons, of whom John Aristobulus succeeded, and was speedily followed by Alexander Jaunai. On his death his queen, Alexandra, was declared regent. She sided with the Pharisees, who thereupon regained their ascendancy. The late king had left two sons, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. The former who had been named by his father as his successor, was now made high priest. The succession, however, was disputed by Aristobulus, who attained the pontificate and the throne. Hyrcanus making a vigorous effort to recover his rights, Aris-

tobulus entered into negotiations with Pompey, then concluding those victorious eastern campaigns, in which he had finally triumphed over the brave Mithridates. The Roman general taking advantage of some prevarications in the conduct of Aristobulus, poured his legions into Judea, and by the capture of Jerusalem, reduced the Jewish territory to a Roman province. The king made a fruitless attempt to emancipate the nation from this new thralldom, which resulted in a yet more complete subjugation of the province by Gabinius, who, in settling the affairs of the state, confirmed Hyrcanus in the high-priesthood, and removed the civil administration from the Sanhedrim, by investing it in five local courts, in as many districts, into which he divided the country, Jerusalem, Jericho, Gadara, Amathis, and Sephoris (*Jos. B. Jud.* 1, 8 § 5; *Antt.* 14, 5 §4).

When Julius Cæsar shortly after obtained the ascendancy, he abolished the form of government settled by Gabinius, restored the Sanhedrim, confirmed the pontificate in the family of Hyrcanus, and appointed Antipater procurator of the province, (*ἐπίτροπος τῆς ἰουδαίας*). Antipater had two sons, Phasael, whom he made governor of Judea, and Herod, who was appointed governor of Galilee. In the struggle which now ensued, Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, with the purchased aid of the Parthians made a stroke for the crown, and succeeded for a while. Phasael destroyed himself by poison, and Hyrcanus, by bodily mutilation, was rendered unfit for the high-priesthood; but Herod meanwhile obtained a decree of the Roman Senate, appointing him king of Judea.

Now, in the lapse of these distressful years, the Sanhedrim had been gradually losing its civil prerogatives, but aggrandizing its importance as the seat of the Mosaic and traditional authority. Danger and calamity only render the law more endeared to the Jew, and fearful as the times often were, the rabbinical schools at Jerusalem were still peopled by increasing multitudes of students. From about 65—30 B. C., we find the presidency and vice-presidency of the Sanhedrim occupied by Shemaja (*Σαμαίας*, *Jos. Antt.* 14, 9, 8.) and Abta-

lion (*Πολλίον*, Antt. 15, 1: 1, 10. 4). But the political relations, subsisting between Palestine and the Romans, prevented anything like independent action on the part of that tribunal; besides, Herod was not disposed to tolerate any independent authority co-ordinate with his own. His first appearance before the Sanhedrim even during the life time of Hyrcanus, when he occupied only a subordinate position, had already proved that he did not acknowledge its sacred character; for when summoned to answer for some arbitrary acts, he appeared at the head of a considerable force before the overawed Senate, not in the garb of a culprit, but armed from head to foot, and more like an accuser than one accused. Of all the Senators only Shemaja ventured to protest against this presumption. He reprobated energetically the insolent conduct of the youth, and Herod had to flee, but soon returned again at the head of an army to take vengeance, but was diverted only from the execution of his purpose by the entreaties of his father and brother, (Jos. Antt. 14, 9, 4).

Only very few enactments of these leaders of the Sanhedrim have come down to us, yet the influence which their great learning and unflinching integrity gave them among the people at large, and especially among the succeeding doctors of the law, was such as to secure for any question an authoritative reception if it could be traced to have been propounded by Shemaja and Abtalion, who were styled *the two magnates of their day*. The two recorded principles of these two doctors were: Shemaja said: "love thy trade, hate the dominion, and befriend not thyself with the worldly power," (Aboth 1, 10), whilst Abtalion said: "ye wise men, be careful in your utterances, lest ye be condemned to captivity, and led into exile, to places of obnoxious waters, from which if your pupils drink, they will die, whereby the name of God would be dishonored." (ib. v. ii). Both were held in great veneration by the good in Israel, and though neither of them was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, being both of proselyted fathers by Jewish mothers, yet "their works," it was said, "were as the works of the sons of Aaron," (Juchasin, fol. 17; Wolf,

*Bibl. Hebr.* iv, 378).\* Great as was the learning, the integrity, and the influence of all the foregoing Scribes, yet Hillel I, who now succeeded to the presidential throne (B. C. 30—10 A. D.), surpassed in these and many other respects all his predecessors.

*Hillel I*, surnamed *ḥiḥil*, or the Great,† called also the second Ezra, or the restorer of the law, under whose presidency Christ was born, was born in Babylon about 75 B. C., of poor parents, although descended in the female line from the house of David. He settled at Jerusalem about 37 B. C., where he had to support himself by the labor of his hands and attended at the same time the lectures of Shemaja and Abtalion, who were the heads of the Sanhedrim. So great was his thirst after knowledge, that he gave daily half of his scanty earnings to the door-keeper of the college, in order to be admitted to the lectures. One day his supply of money had failed, and he was refused admittance. Although in the depth of winter, the zealous scholar rather than lose the day's instruction, climbed from the outside up to the window, where he sat still till he was completely covered with snow, and rendered insensible by the cold. As the heap thus formed before the window, greatly obscured the light, it attracted the attention of Shemaja, and when the cause came to be examined, the body of Hillel was found under the snow, and apparently lifeless. Though it was on the Sabbath, the necessary remedies were procured, and he was restored to life. From that time on, Hillel was looked upon as the future guide, and became president of the Sanhedrim about 30 B. C. His cardinal doctrine and aim of life were "to be gentle, shewing all meekness to all men," and "when reviled not to revile again," and his grand dictum, since so widely propa-

\* Graetz, *Gesch. d. Juden iii*, 481, rather thinks them to be Alexandrian Jews, and the notion of their having been proselytes rests upon the misinterpretation of a passage in the Talmud.

† On the merits of Hillel, comp. Delitzsch, *Jesus and Hillel*, with reference to Renan and Geiger, Erlangen, 1867, a translation of which the writer of this Article has ready in MSS.

gated, "do not unto another what thou wouldest not have another do unto thee."

It will not be out of place to speak here of those two advocates of Hillel, who through their attempts to set aside the claims of Jesus of Nazareth, in order to elevate their idol, have acquired much celebrity, viz. Mr. *Renan*, and the late Rabbi Geiger of Berlin. "Renan," says Dr. Liddon,\* "suggests not without some hesitation that Hillel was the real teacher of Jesus."† "As an instance," says Mr. Liddon, "of our Lord's real independence of Hillel, a single example may suffice. A recent writer on "The Talmud," gives the following story: 'One day a heathen went to Shammai, the head of the rival academy, and asked him mockingly to convert him to the law, while he stood on one leg. The irate master turned him from the door. He then went to Hillel, who gave him that reply—*since so widely propagated*—'do not unto another, etc. This is the whole law, the rest is mere commentary.'‡ Or as Hillel's words are rendered by Lightfoot: 'Quod tibi ipsum odiosum est, proximo ne feceris: nam haec est tota lex.'§ The writer in the QUARTERLY REVIEW appears to assume the identity of Hillel's saying with the precept of our blessed Lord (Matt. 7: 12; Luke 6: 31).|| Yet in truth how wide is the interval between the merely *negative* rule of the Jewish president, and the positive precept—"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you,

\* *Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ*, New York, 1869, 4th ed., p. 107.

† "Hillel fut le vrai maître de Jesus, s'il est permis de parler de maître quand il s'agit d'une si haute originalité." *Vie de Jesus*, p. 35.

‡ QUARTERLY REVIEW, Oct., 1867, p. 441, Art. "The Talmud," reprinted in the *literary remains* of E. Deutsch, New York, 1874, p. 31.

§ HORAE HEBRAICAE IN MATTHAEUM, p. 129.

|| No wonder. The writer of the QUART. REVIEW, was Mr. E. Deutsch, Librarian of the British Museum. The impression of the article was, that it was written by a Christian, for the writer speaks of "our Saviour." But the expression of this modern Jew, sounds like Judas' "hail master, and kissed Him." The Jewish author hides himself behind the Christian mask. Beware of being bewitched with this German Judaizing novelty by making application to the old adage:—*Timeo Danaos, ac sidona ferentes.*"—VIRGIL ÆNEID, II. 49.



do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets"—of the Divine Master." Thus far Mr. Liddon.

But whatever may be said of the precept, (Matt. 7 : 12) as to its being considered as a fresh discovery in moral science, most certainly Hillel cannot claim the merit of originality in respect to it. It existed long before his time. In the Apocryphal book Tobit, which was written most probably between 250—200 B. C., we read words like those which he used (ch. 4 : 15): "Do not to another that which thou hatest," and in Eccles. 31 : 15 (written about 290—280 B. C.) we read: "Judge of the disposition of thy neighbor by thyself, and in everything act with consideration." Ancient history bears ample testimony to the existence of this maxim among the ancient Greeks, long before the time of Hillel. *Diogenes Laertius* relates, that Aristotle (+ after 322 B. C.) being asked how we ought to carry ourselves to our friends, answered "as we would wish they would carry themselves to us." And Isocrates, who lived 400 years before the publication of the Gospel, said: "We must not do to others, that which would cause anger, if it were done to ourselves," &c. Even among the sayings of Confucius, the golden rule of the Saviour, which Luke designates as the foundation of all social virtue, this maxim is found in the negative form: "What you do not wish done to yourself, do not to others."

Dr. Delitzsch, in his pamphlet referred to (note p. 266) says: "Renan is yet too much of a Christian, that he should put Hillel above Jesus, though he praises him much, for he says: 'Though Hillel will never be looked upon as the real founder of Christianity,' Jesus however followed Hillel for the most part. Hillel had given utterance to aphorisms fifty years before, which greatly resembled his own. Dr. Geiger, however, the late Rabbi of the Jews at Berlin, in his lectures on "Judaism and its History," affirmed that Jesus was a Pharisee, and a follower of Hillel. *He never gave utterance to a new idea* (einen neuen gedanken sprach er keinesweges aus). "Hillel," he adds, "was a genuine reformer." But he never was a reformer. Dr. Geiger is the first to give him this name, and he does it merely to attempt to disparage Jesus.



As Dr. Delitzsch well observes: "A real reformer in a good sense of the word, is one who is endued with creative energy; who brings back the religion of a nation, which had become defaced and deformed, to its original state, and thus breathes new life into a great community, like that which it originally possessed. Samuel and Ezra were reformers of this class. Hillel changed nothing. He kept things as he found them. It is indeed true that he introduced a few innovations in the civil law concerning lending money and buying and selling, which suggest cunning contrivances for evading the laws of Moses, but in other respects, all he did was to carry out more fully the system of tradition taught by the Pharisees; he gave himself no trouble as to the religious state of the nation at large, and did nothing whatever to awaken religious life, which was in such a decayed state, or to give it a new impulse. History tells us what Jesus did. We have no need to write again this history. It is only necessary that we look at that which is actually before us, and do not wilfully shut our eyes. Hillel was no reformer. Where is the original form of the religion of his nation, as restored by him?"

We return again to Hillel. His learning was celebrated in hyperbolical language. It was said to have embraced not only Scripture and tradition, but languages, geography, natural history—in fact all sciences, human and superhuman. In the Talmud (*Succa 28a* & *Baba Bathra 134a*) we read, that Hillel had no less than one thousand pupils, of whom eighty were said to have been specially distinguished. Of these, thirty were described as worthy that the divine glory should rest upon them as it did upon Moses; thirty, that at their command the sun should stand still in the firmament, as in the case of Joshua, while only twenty were less noted. Amongst them Jonathan ben Uziel was the most distinguished, while Jochanan ben Saccai, was the least celebrated.

Hillel was the first who laid a regular system of hermeneutics for the interpretation of the written law, his so-called "seven rules:" 1, Inference from minor to major; 2, The analogy of ideas, or analogous inferences; 3, Analogy of two objects in one verse; 4, analogy of two objects in two verses;

5, General and special; 6, Analogy of another passage; 7, The connection.\* Hillel also originated some changes in the management of the theological schools, and was the first to introduce the distinctive title of Rabban, Rabbi, and Rab, (the latter being applied to extra—Palestinian teachers).† He also introduced the so-called *Prosbul*. According to the Hebrew canons, the Sabbatical year cancels every debt, whether lent on a bill or not. It does not cancel accounts for goods, daily wages for labor, which may be performed in the Sabbatical year, unless they have been converted into a loan; or the legal fines imposed upon one who committed a rape, or was guilty of seduction (Exod. 20: 11, 15, 16), or slander, or any judicial penalties; nor does it set aside a debt contracted on a pledge, or on a declaration made before the court of justice, at the time of lending, not to remit the debt in the Sabbatical year. The formula of this legal declaration was as follows: וְפִלוֹנִי מִדִּינִים שְׁבִמְהוֹם פְּלוֹנִי שָׁקֵל הוֹב לִי שְׁאֲנִבְנוּ כָּל יָמֵן שְׁאֲרָצָה מוֹסֵר אֲנִי לָכֶם אִשׁ פְּלוֹנִי (פֶּשֶׁשׁ) i. e. I, N. N. deliver to you, the judges of the district N., the declaration, that I may call in at any time I like all debts due to me," and it was signed either by the judges or witnesses. If this Prosbul was ante-dated it was legal, but it was invalid if post-dated. If one borrowed money from five different persons, a Prosbul was necessary from each individual; but if, on the contrary, one lent money to five different persons, one Prosbul was sufficient for all. This prosbul was introduced by Hillel because he found that the

\*These seven rules of Hillel were afterwards enlarged by R. Ishmael to thirteen. In itself, these rules, as can be seen, are very sensible. In part they only contain the ever binding laws of logic, in part at least correct hermeneutical principles. But the praxis did not correspond with the theory, since in reality by means of these rules the most adventurous inferences were made, and the impossible were made possible, hence this pettifogging and hair-splitting, which we meet with so often in the Talmud, and by far surpasses the scholastic subtleties of the Mediaeval Church.

†Rabban was the title of the president of the Sanhedrim, in contradistinction to the president of a college, who was styled Rabbi.

warning contained in Deut. 15 : 9 was disregarded, the rich would not lend to the poor for fear of the Sabbatical year, which seriously impeded commercial and social intercourse, (Mishna Shebüth 10 : 1—5 ; Gittin 4 : 3).

Hillel's apophthegms, which are handed down to us in the *Pirke Aboth*, are worthy of attention: "Separate not thyself from the congregation, and have no confidence in thyself till the day of thy death ; judge not thy neighbor until thou art in his situation ; say not, that something, which cannot be understood at present, that it will be understood at last ; say not, I will repent when I shall have leisure, lest that leisure should never be thine ; an ignorant man cannot properly abhor sin ; a peasant cannot be pious, a bashful person cannot become learned, the passionate will never be a teacher, nor he who engages much in business a sage ; in the place where there is not a man, be thou a man."

A poetical impromptu of his on seeing a skull floating on the water, conveys his idea of retribution :

"Because thou madest float,  
They made thee float—  
In turn who made thee float  
Shall also float."

Another of his maxims was: "The more flesh, the more worms ; the more wealth, the more care ; the more wives, the more witchcraft ; the more women-servants, the more vice ; the more men-servants, the more robbery ; but the more learning in the law, the more life ; the more study, the more knowledge, the more counsel, the more prudence ; the more righteousness, the more peace ; he who gains a good name, gains it for himself, and he who gains the law, gains eternal life." (*Aboth* 2 : 5—8). "Be of the disciples of Aaron, who loved peace, and pursued peace, loving mankind and attracting them to the law."

"Each one who seeks a name  
Shall only love his fame :  
Who adds not to his lore  
Shall lose it more and more :

Each one deserves to perish  
 Who study does not cherish :  
 That man shall surely fade  
 Who with his crown does trade."

"If I live not a holy life for myself, who can do it for me? And when I fully consider myself, what am I? and if not now, when shall I?" (b. 1 : 12—14).

Hillel died ten years after the birth of Christ. He was the founder of a family and race of hierarchs in the wisdom and administration of the law, who, in fifteen generations (A. D. 10—415) held the dignity of *nasim* or "patriarchs."

Of Shammai, Hillel's colleague, but comparatively little is known. Though one of his maxims was, "let the study of the law be fixed, say little and do much, and receive every one with the aspect of a fair countenance," (Aboth 1 : 15), "yet he is said to have been a man of a forbidding and uncompromising temper, and, in this respect, as in others, the counterpart of his illustrious companion, of whom, both in their dispositions and divisions on a multitude of rabbinical questions, he was, as we may say, the antithesis. Though each gave often a decision the reverse of the other, yet, by a sort of fiction in the practice of the schools, these contrary decisions were held to be co-ordinate in authority, and, if we may believe the Talmud, was confirmed as of like authority by a *Bath Kol* (a voice from heaven); or at least while a certain conclusion of Hillel's was affirmed, it was revealed that the opposite one of Shammai was not to be denied as heretical. Although both were rabbinically one, yet their disciples formed two irreconcilable parties, alike the Scotists and Thomists of the Middle Ages, whose mutual dissidence manifested itself not in the strife of words only, but also in that of blows, and, in some cases, of bloodshed. So great was the antagonism between them, that it was said, that "Elijah the Tishbite would never be able to reconcile the disciples of Hillel and Shammai."

The age of Hillel was, in many respects, the most distinguished. It was also that in which He appeared and came

"To heal all the wounds of the world  
The Son of the Virgin was born."

Most, if not all the Rabbins, who lived at that period, as Papias, Ben Bagh Bagh, Jôchanan the Horonite, and others, must have witnessed His advent, have taught during His lifetime, and had more or less share in His rejection and death. Considering the state of the synagogue, can we still wonder at this? Could their pride and exclusiveness, their wrangling and learning, their religious zeal and ardor, have found satisfaction in the life, the work, or teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, which were in direct antagonism with their own? Both systems could not co-exist. Either He or they must go down. His ascendancy would be their undoing.

Hillel was followed in the presidency by his son Simeon. Whether this Simeon is the same, as has been asserted by Athanasius and Epiphanius, who is described by St. Luke as embracing the infant Saviour in the Temple, cannot be ascertained.

The next in the presidency was Hillel's grandson, *Gamaliel I. the elder* (A. D. 30—50), the teacher of the apostle Paul, and the same who gave the temperate advice which led to the suspension of the persecution of the early Church. Among Jewish doctors, Gamaliel had been honored with the title of "Rabban." As Aquinas among the schoolmen was called *Doctor Angelicus*, and Bonaventura *Doctor Seraphicus*, so Gamaliel was called the "Beauty of the Law." He is held to have been the thirty-fifth receiver of the traditions from Mount Sinai; and he added to all the amplitude of Hebrew lore a large acquaintance with Gentile literature; the study of Greek being connived at, in his case, by his rabbinical brethren, on the plea of his having need of that language in diplomatic transactions with the secular government. A master also in the astronomy of that day, he could test, it is said, the witnesses for the new moon, by a chart of the lunar motions he had constructed for the purpose. His astronomic skill was employed also in the rectification of the Jewish calendar. It is recorded that he delighted much in the study

of nature, and in the beautiful in all its manifestations. In short, Gamaliel appears to have been a man of an enlarged and refined mind, and no very stringent Pharisee, though connected with the sect. Casual notices of him in the Talmud make this evident. Thus, he had a figure engraved upon his seal, a thing of which no strict Pharisee could approve. Nor could such an one have permitted himself to enter a public bath in which was a statue of Aphrodite. But this Gamaliel is reported to have done at Ptolemais, justifying himself by the argument that the bath had been built before the statue was there; that the building had been erected not as a temple, but as a bath, and as such he used it; and, moreover, that if it were not lawful for him to be except where idolatry had *not* held its rites, he should not be able to find a place to remain in upon the face of the earth. (Aboda Sarah iii. iv.) "Far in advance of his times, were his humane laws, that the poor heathen should have the same right as the poor Jews to gather the gleanings after the harvest, and that the Jews on meeting heathen should greet them—"peace be with you"—even on their festival days when they are mostly engaged in worshipping their idols. It was owing to these laws, which redound to the honor of Gamaliel, that it afterwards became customary to make equal provisions for the poor heathen and Jews, to attend to the sick heathen, to bestow the last honors on their dead, and to comfort their mourners, in towns which were inhabited by Jews and Gentiles, (Gittin 59*b*; 61 sq.; Jerus. Gittin c. 5).

The attitude assumed by Gamaliel toward the Christians, has induced others to surmise that this distinguished Rabbi was at heart a believer in Jesus, and that he was openly baptized before his death by St. Peter and St. Paul, together with his son Gamaliel and Nicodemus. But these notices are altogether irreconcilable with the esteem and respect in which he was held in later times by the Jewish rabbins, and who never doubted the soundness of his creed.\* "Indeed

---

\*Though the historical evidence is against tradition, respecting the baptism of Gamaliel, Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, iv. p. 437) tells us, that

the two systems of Judaism and Christianity had now become so strongly defined, as to render neutrality in the case of a man so publicly known impossible. Jews and Christians, as such, could no longer coalesce. One cause was the antagonism of Christianity to the corruptions with which Rabbinism had damaged the Jewish system. For while the new communion had accepted all the truths, and retained all the permanent realities of the O. T. dispensation, it speedily, and in the spirit inculcated by the teachings of its Divine Founder, disengaged itself from the human and oppressive additions of the Sopherim. But as these mischievous corruptions had become the religion, so to speak, of the mass of the people, as well as an effective apparatus of government in the practice of their spiritual rulers, the propagators of the new faith found it extremely difficult to make a favorable impression on the nation at large. Then the catholicity of the evangelical dispensation was opposed to the favorite ideas of the Jewish mind. The elect people identified with the reign of the expected Deliverer their own ascendancy over a vassal world; but the Gospel proclaimed the advent of the Messiah of all nations, whose sceptre was to shed equal blessings on all the tribes of the earth. The Saviour of our race had been manifested, not to aggrandize a sect, but to redeem a world; to be a light to illumine the Gentiles, as well as to be the glory of his people Israel." (Etheridge).

in a Church at Pisa, the tomb of Gamaliel the elder was shown, who was converted to Christianity, and whom the Church canonized. The tomb, which contains the remains of many such converts, bears the following inscription :

Hoc in Sarcophago requiescent corpora sacra  
Sanctorum. \* \* Sanctus Gamaliel. \* \*  
Gamaliel divi Pauli didasculus olim,  
Doctor et excellens Israelita fuit,  
Concillii magni fideique peromnia cultor.

This statement, however contradicts Jewish tradition, according to which Gamaliel was buried in Jamnia or Jabne, and whose tomb was visited by Parchi in the fourteenth century, (cf. Zunz, in Asher's "Benjamin of Judea, ii. pp. 439, 440).

Some time after his elevation to the presidency, Gamaliel, pressed by the distresses of time, transferred the locality of the synhedrical schools from Jerusalem to Jamnia, or Jabne, a town near the shores of the Mediterranean, and between the ancient cities of Joppa and Ashdod. He there completed the labors of his life, and died some fifteen years before the final ruin of his country. At his decease men said that "the glory of the law had ceased, and purity and abstinence died away." (*Mishna Sota ix, 15*).

The recorded theological principle of Gamaliel expresses his adherence to traditionalism, and his abhorrence of Pharisaical wrangling and hypocritical over-scrupulousness. It is: "Procure thyself a teacher, avoid being in doubt, and do not accustom thyself to give tithes by guess." (*Aboth 1, 16*).

Of Simeon II, the son of Gamaliel I, (50—10 A. D.), little is known, save that he took an active part in the defence of Jerusalem and fell one of the many victims of the national struggle, called the "killed for the kingdom."

Contemporary with Gamaliel, was Jochanan ben Saccai, (probably the same John who is mentioned as one of the members of that council before which the apostles were summoned (*Acts 4: 6*). There is no doubt that the interview on that occasion with the apostles, impressed itself so deeply upon his mind, that he never could have effaced it from his memory, and we connect with it that anguish of spirit about his eternal state which Jochanan displayed on his deathbed.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, Jochanan convoked a Sanhedrim at Jamnia, (whither the synodical schools had already been transferred by Gamaliel), of which he was chosen Abba or president. In the hands of this council the work of transforming and adapting Judaism to the altered political circumstances proved a task of little difficulty. Jamnia had only to be substituted for Jerusalem, a few ordinances to be discontinued or slightly altered, and certain prayers or good works to be substituted for the sacrifices, and the change was effected without leaving any trace of violent revolution. In principle, Jochanan was a Hillelite, while in his practice, he followed the school of Shammai. It



was his fundamental principle: "If thou hast much learned in this law, attribute it not to thy goodness; seeing thou hast been created for that very purpose." (Aboth 2 : 8). He died on his bed in the arms of his disciples. His dying words were—"Fear God ever as you fear men." His disciples seemed astonished. He added—"He who would commit a sin, first looks round to discover whether any man sees him; so take ye heed, that God's all-seeing eye see not the sinful thought in your heart." There is another of his last words, which show what St. Paul calls "the spirit of bondage unto fear," (Rom. 8 : 5,) under which even virtuous men under the Jewish dispensation lived and died. His disciples addressed him: "Rabbi, light of Israel, thou strong rock, right hand pillar, why dost thou weep?" He answered them: "If they were about to lead me before a king of flesh and blood, who is to-day here, and to-morrow in the grave, who if he were angry with me, his anger would not last for ever: if he put me in bondage, his bondage would not be everlasting: and if he condemned me to death, that death would not be eternal, whom I could soothe with words and bribe with money; yet even in these circumstances I should weep. But now I am about to appear before the awful majesty of the King of kings, before the Holy and Blessed One, who is, and who liveth for ever, whose just anger may be eternal, who may doom me to everlasting punishment. Should He condemn me, it will be to death without further hope. Nor can I pacify Him with words, nor bribe Him with money. There are two roads before me, one leading to Paradise, the other to Hell, and I know not by which of these I go: should I not weep?" We see thus, in Jochanan's life and death a signal instance of the unsatisfactory character of Rabbinism. Even this famous man was made to feel and exemplify, that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Lightfoot in the spirit of his time and opinion says insultingly: "Oh the wretched and failing faith of a Pharisee in the hour of death," (*academice Japnensis historiae fragmenta*, I, p. 446, ed. Pitman), and a modern writer remarks on these words of Jochanan "what a contrast is presented in the his-

tory of a disciple of the celebrated Rabban Gamaliel, one who had profited above many of his equals in age in the Jew's religion, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of his fathers. He had cast them off; he had counted them loss for Christ, and now, in the prospect of eternity, exultingly exclaims: 'henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day;' and in the animating prospect of the Redeemer's triumph over death, leads on the Christian hosts with the exultant shout, 'O death where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? thanks be to God which giveth us the victory, through Jesus the Messiah, our Lord.' Reynolds, *Six Lectures on the Jews*, London, 1847, p. 131 sq.

We have thus sketched the lives of the most famous scribes down to the times, when the temple was in ashes, and Jerusalem a heap of ruins.

## ARTICLE VIII.

### THE HIGHER EDUCATION WITHOUT GOD.

By C. A. STORK, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

On Washington's birth-day, which happens also to be Commemoration-Day at Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore, Pres. Eliot of Harvard made an address in the Hall of the University on *Higher*, or, as he termed it, *Superior Education*. His remarks were brief and, save on one point, noticeable only for the superfluity of contempt poured out on the smaller Colleges. The point alluded to I propose to take as a text for some observations on the new function that culture seems in the minds of many to be taking on itself.

"The years, he said, have been times of depression and he feared of humiliation to the American people. Many persons hold that the republic can be saved by primary education, but the most despotic government in the world, that of Germany, is that where primary education is most widespread. Despots can reconcile themselves to universal pri-

mary education, but cannot overcome the influence of universal education of a higher type. Well-conducted superior education, the training in knowledge, in writing and speaking of the natural leaders of the people, is the need of this country.

"Heretofore this has been imperfectly done; but it is not alone among the ignorant that are found the advocates of the dangerous measures which threaten the welfare of our country. The influence of superior education, subtle but universal, leads to a high sentiment of honor, and no nation can be happy or strong without it. It is a patriotic work that the Universities of this country should unite in."

The sentiments here expressed are not in themselves novel or doubtful. They only say in a mode adapted to the exigencies of our day, what has been said a great many times. "Well conducted superior education *is* a need of this country;" "the influence of superior education, *does* tend to a high sentiment of honor." As for the assertion about despots being unable to "overcome the influence of education of a higher type," there will be in the minds of those who recall the history of Athens, the complaisance of French professors and *savants* under the Second Empire, and the like passages in the history of civilization, to say nothing of Germany, some difference of opinion. One thing only on this point we are sure of, and that is that despotism can never flourish among a people taught to value religious liberty, the sacredness of the conscience.

It is not so much the sentiments expressed as the new light they take from their setting, that makes them worthy of consideration. Let us look at the peculiar circumstances under which they were spoken. Johns Hopkins University is the latest and probably the strongest of that new type of higher educational establishments springing up in our country, which propose to educate men without any regard to their religious nature. We say nothing about the expediency of that sort of culture; nothing of the absurdity of a scheme of symmetrical training and enlightening which shuts out of its curriculum one whole side of human nature; for I suppose

we have hardly come to the point yet of denying that there is such a thing as religion, and that man has a religious nature. We only say that the secular Universities shut their eyes to that side of human nature: and that Johns Hopkins University is perhaps the best, most characteristic type of that class of establishments. I suppose the founders of this University would not object to take for the motto of their establishment the secularist sentence, "You cannot live for both worlds, because you do not know *both*. You know but *one*. Live for the one you do know." And that, I take it, expresses also the views Pres. Eliot would inculcate in his own University, if he had the ordering of things after his own notions,—notions which are very liberal and humane in all respects, save in this one point that they have no eye for what men generally recognize as the religious. This our two Presidents, Gilman and Eliot, will probably say is no great defect: one of them perhaps would claim it as a merit. This, however, is aside from the point of view we wish to take.

What we wish to point out, is that Pres. Eliot's sentiments about superior education being a protection against corruption and immorality mean something very different in his mouth and spoken in the hall of Johns Hopkins University from those same sentiments uttered by an avowed believer in Christianity speaking before a University founded in the interests of learning and religion. If Dr. Woolsey had spoken these same words at Princeton, we would all supply the *lacunae*; we would know that he called superior education a protection against corruption, and a guide to a high sentiment of honor only as a force working in harmony with religion. We would know that while he was speaking of the hand-maid his eye was really on the mistress. But when Pres. Eliot speaks in the hall of John Hopkins we cannot suppose there are any unspoken references in his address; he does not have in his eye the mistress standing behind her maiden; he does not believe there is any mistress, or if there is, that we can know or teach any thing about her. He and the University he addresses know nothing about supernatural

power. They believe in what they can see and demonstrate. So when he says that "superior education leads to a high sentiment of honor, and no nation can be happy or strong without it," he means that this is sufficient alone. He has arranged his counteracting forces that are to resist the dangerous elements that threaten society—there they are—"superior education, subtle and universal," with God and religion and conscience, so far as that has any supernatural authority, left out.

It is very evident what President Eliot had before his mind's eye when he called for the purifying agencies of "Superior Education:" he was thinking of the Silver Bill, and the high carnival of folly and fraud in Congress, and the wild tumult of the great sea of popular passion and ignorance roaring for cheap money. The whole spectacle shocked him. It seemed to him dreadful that men should be so led away by passion and unreasoning self-interest. In short he had suddenly come in contact with the natural man. Perhaps the President of Harvard would not recognize whom we mean by that term. He will be thinking of some theological abstraction, some quiddity of the school-men. But really the last thing in the world we would say about 'the natural man,' is that he is a theological abstraction, a metaphysical quiddity: he is only too real. The theologians did not make him; the school-men did not cogitate him. They found him, not in their studies, in dim recondite gropings through labyrinths of abstract speculation, but on the street, at the table, in the shop, on the throne, in the gutter, even in the university; and it was because he gave them such a world of trouble, not metaphysical, notional trouble, but practical trouble; because he robbed them and beat them, violated their wives, cut their throats, and when he was not quite so violent as that, envied them, maligned, sneered at them, coveted their goods, and even when he was educated, was a selfish, egotistic, self-complacent, ambitious, proud creature, making no end of trouble even in the most highly cultured circles, that they made such an ado about him, and

even came to the conclusion, no doubt very absurd in Pres. Eliot's eyes, that some force above nature, a supernatural power, was needed to reform him and make him what he ought to be. This last conclusion it was among other things that made them insist so strenuously on another speculative idea, which Pres. Eliot and other friends of "Superior Education" think very light of by—the being of God.

But let us stick to our new discovery, for such it doubtless must seem to Pres. Eliot,—'the natural man.' If the name is obnoxious to the friends of "superior education," perhaps some other term might be found. We will not quarrel about names; it is the thing we want; and about that we are nearly all agreed—even Pres. Eliot has a certain dread mixed with perplexity at this quality in man, (that which the theologians call the 'natural man'), which drives him to eat and drink too much, to get his own way, to trample on his neighbor's rights, to steal, to cheat, to lie, to be vicious, to envy and hate, to quarrel, to behave himself, in short, in such a way, that, however we may philosophise about the cause, or the responsibility connected with it, we all ask how can we cure him? Yes, that is the question, the practical question about the whole matter; and that is really the great drift of revealed religion,—to get the 'natural man changed. It does not take much study of the Bible to find out that its aim is not so much to speculate about this 'natural man,' to philosophise on the unknowable, as it is to cure him.

But a "superior education" has no room for so primary a work on morals as the Bible. Then it must confront the problem alone. Here is the 'natural man:' he is still vicious, unaccountably fond of vile ways, with a real love for rascality, unamenable to reason, unchangeable by any kind of government or educational manipulation. All sorts of politics, social atmospheres, sanitary measures, educational remedies, have been applied to him, and nothing has ever done him any good, but religion. Even that has not restrained him much, but yet it has restrained. He changes his plan of operations, he transforms his outward appearance, but at bottom, in his heart, he is the same natural man. He is no longer a soul-

less Greek given over to unnatural vices. He has got over his ferocious carnivorous mood, when he was a Roman. He is no free-booting baron of the Middle Ages; he does not drink himself under the table every night, after the style of Queen Anne's age. But here he is the same inwardly bad fellow. He appears in all sorts of shapes, we all have something of him in us; but just now his great demonstration is as the silver-man, or rather as the debtor seeking to outwit his creditor. It is in this capacity that he alarms Pres. Eliot, and sets him to prescribing his nostrum of "superior education."

Now here is where the new friends of morality, those who would have a morality without any religion, or at least without any God, part company with those who believe in supernatural religion. We are all agreed, that there is such a thing as virtue, that morality is a good thing, nay, that it is an absolute necessity for man. We are all agreed as to a disposition in man to do a great many things he ought not, a certain craze, or disease that drives him into bad conduct. Here the religion and non-religion part company. We say, man goes wrong because he has broken loose from God, and there will be no cure for his bad disposition, no real permanent stay to his folly and immorality, till he has been brought back to God; in short the only cure for the natural man is religion. But Pres. Eliot says, no, the "superior education" will set him right.

It is a gain, though not a very great gain, that the advocates of the regeneration of the race by education, have been driven to qualify their faith in the reforming power of knowledge. It is no longer education, but only "superior education" that can make man what he ought to be. Time was, and that not so long ago, when we heard on every hand, only teach the people, give them light, and crime and vice and sin will gradually slink out of sight. But now it appears that only a great deal of light of the very highest order will answer. Pres. Eliot admits that primary education is no security against despotism; he tacitly admits that mere common schools will not make the people honest. So

much is gained. Not much it is true; the wonder is it was not seen long ago that mere reading and writing, the multiplication table, and a smattering of geography and grammar, could not cure a man's bad disposition. How could they? In what relation does a knowledge of the alphabet, the ability to read the newspaper, or to add up a column of figures, stand to a man's indulgence of his appetites? Why should a knowledge of book-keeping by double entry make me less selfish? Well, we are past that.

But now we are told the "superior education" will be our salvation. But pray how?

The "superior education" as far as the matter of it goes, is only primary education carried further on. It does not give anything different in kind from the curriculum of the small college. It takes up the natural sciences and gives fuller, deeper, more minute instruction; it takes up letters and trains a fine perception; it takes up the fine arts, and on this Pres. Eliot lays special stress, but it really gives nothing that differs in the direction of its influence from what belongs to all education, be it higher or lower. What, I say then, is there in this fuller, minuter, knowledge that cures the natural man! Is there anything more corrective to the appetite in the theory of curves than there is in the rule of three? Would a fine discrimination in the niceties of the endless schools of Italian painting make a man less selfish?

But perhaps by "superior education" is meant the effect produced on the mind by a great breadth of view; the more advanced the culture, the more complex of course the combination of new ideas. By knowing a great deal about a vast number of fields, and by the habit of mind formed in the mastery of this knowledge, in investigation, by sifting, comparing, and arranging one's knowledge there is formed a very different texture of mind from that produced in a limited education. But after all it is only a matter of degree. There is no point where you can draw the line, and say, on this side education is *primary* and so incapable of acting as a great moral agent, on the other it is *superior* and becomes a spiritual force.



The whole theory of regenerating man by education is based on the assumption, that what cures a bad disposition is light. One is tempted here to repeat what the great Master of morals, of conduct, said about the effect of light on man's bad disposition, that the trouble with men was not that they had not light, but that when light came they did not want it, that they refused it, and fought against it. But to keep to our line of argument: we say no amount of information, of breadth of view, of training of the reasoning powers, and of the faculties of taste, is going to have the slightest effect by itself on man's conduct. For that is wrong not by defect of knowledge, or narrowness of outlook, or weakness of the logical faculty, or faultiness of the eye or ear; but by a positive quality. It is a positive force that will go after what it wants. And when the pagan poet said "I see the better but the worse pursue," he described just the case we have to deal with, that if a being who goes wrong when he has plenty of light, who goes wrong because he has a force in him that nerves itself, that chooses to defy what is right.

It has been so over and over again in the history of the world. Men have had a fair start again and again; and again and again they have, despite all the *superior education* afforded them, (and some of it has been much superior to anything that can be had at Harvard or Johns Hopkins,) gone steadily down. They have had it in Egypt, in Greece, in Rome, in every great country in Europe. And always an unaccountable element showed itself, a vicious element, and in spite of all efforts it conquered every time. Nothing yet has ever eliminated it: reverse the terms, put them how you will, there the bad quantity appears, not a negative, but a pressing, positive quantity; a quality that bites-in, that eats through everything, national character, literary culture, refined taste, primitive simplicity, inherited virtues. When we are told then, as we watch with dread the outbreak of this natural man in the socialistic movements of the day, that a higher culture, more natural science, and letters, and fine arts, and mental breadth, is going to be the cure, we are thrown out; we cannot see how the two stand related. What

has any amount of knowledge or mental training to do with a wish, a disposition? The medicine does not get down to the spot. It does not get at the will, the inner man.

Theology has its own solution of the problem, and declares that it can be worked out successfully. In fact religion does succeed in eliminating this bad quality. It has done it in millions of cases. It does, by the admission of statesmen and philosophers of every age, put a great restraint on the natural man. The only reason it does not do more is because on its own confession the force to be opposed is so terrible, so indomitable, so almost super-human; it has had a hard fight thus far with the natural man, but it is on the way to win.

But what has "superior education" to say of *its* success? What force is there in it? None. It does not even suffice to keep the philosopher in order himself. What, then, can it do outside?

The appeal it will be urged, however, must be to facts, the high *a priori* road of discussion will only lead us out into the wilderness. Well, what are the facts,? It must be confessed as things are arranged in this world it will be a long time before the experiment can be fully tried. As men are situated, considering what is required for high culture, all the vast forces of leisure, means, apparatus, and natural aptitude for training, it seems hopeless to expect that "superior education" shall ever be possible to more than a mere fraction, and that an infinitesimally small one, of the race. Nothing short of a miracle could provide "superior education" for any but a handful of leaders. So if we are to wait till their advanced training takes the natural man into hand, we may as well give the thing up, at least for this cycle of history. Perhaps however it is hoped that from this high mount of privilege, from this aristocratic group of culture, there will descend powerful influence on the masses; as Pres. Eliot puts it "*an influence of superior education subtle but universal.*" But this of course is mere speculation, too, we are still on the high *a priori* road. Let us get down if we can to the common dirt road of *facts*. What are the facts about *superior education* divorced from religion.

Perhaps the most perfect realization of the ideal of "superior education" made general, is to be found in the case of Athens. When we think of a University, nothing so fills the general notion as that picture of the great city when she was, as Pericles said, the "schoolmistress" of Greece; not the "mistress" of a primary school, but of a liberal, subtle, penetrating, various culture, in short a true University: "To what foreign land," said a Syracusan, when ruin threatened her, "to what foreign land will men betake themselves for liberal education if Athens be destroyed?" The training she afforded was of that highest kind which does not depend on books, and rules, on the following of the letter. Men did not flock there to read books, to con lessons. It is said that in the age of Plato, there was not a book store in Athens. It was the kind of education of which Pres. Eliot makes such account, when he says, that honor and high tone are caught from contact with noble minds. And so it was at Athens. "A people so speculative," says a writer on University training, "so imaginative, who thrive upon mental activity as other races upon mental repose, and to whom it came as natural to think, as to a barbarian to smoke or to sleep. Such a people were in a true sense born teachers, and merely to live among them was a cultivation of mind."

That was a true University, coming nearer to the realization of our ideal of a broad, a subtle and penetrating culture, that not only instructs and trains the man, but really enters into the fibre of his nature and new-makes it, than anything the world has seen before or since. Without disparaging the atmosphere and influence of Oxford, or Harvard, or Johns Hopkins, which are very noble and potent, one feels that they and all their apparatus would show, by the side of this ancient university city, a very meagre aspect. Take the charming picture of this great city, mistress of culture, drawn by Dr. Newman in his famous Chapter on University Life at Athens,—with its sculptures of Phidias, its paintings of Polygnotus, its dramas of Sophocles and Æschylus, its Agora swayed by Lysias and Demosthenes, its tombs of the mighty dead with Pericles declaiming among them, its Aca-

deme where the presence of Plato is a school without his words, its Lyceum where Aristotle paces to and fro discussing with his pupils, its garden where Epicurus reclines, its porch with Zeno sitting there,—look at this picture, I say, and then when we have grasped the idea of a culture so genial, so penetrating, so omnipresent to every part of our human nature, so transforming, let us think of our great Universities, and do they not seem as rude barbarian establishments, very vigorous, but very raw? I fancy I see an accomplished Athenian repaying with interest the contempt which Pres. Eliot pours out so lavishly on the small Colleges. He would go round to the libraries and the museums, he would listen to the recitations of the undergraduates in mathematics and rhetoric; he would visit the art-galleries; he would attend the lectures of Mr. Fiske in Cosmic Philosophy; he would hear what Presidents Eliot and Gilman have to say about the true, the beautiful, and the good; he would be present at the Commencement Exercises;—and what would he think of it all? Would he wish that he could have been born two thousand years later, so he might have sat at the feet of Mr. Fiske, and heard Dr. Eliot lecture on chemistry? Would he exchange the company of Plato, the sway of Pericles, for the lectures of Mr. Huxley on Evolution, and Mr. Tyndall's interesting experiments on light?

Well, we have, then, the ideal University with the perfection of culture, derived from contact with the noblest of minds: and what is the result? In politics that master-demagogue, that father of all blatherskites, Cleon, steps into the vacant place of Pericles: we have presently the cowardly populace now raging against Philip, now fleeing like sheep before him. We have the downward plunge of the whole community into frivolous baseness that at last made the name *Greek* a by-word; we have the nameless vices that spread pollution along the shores of Italy: we have what one sees in the museum "*oggetti osceni*" at Naples. We have a national degeneracy so wretched, so disintegrating that the last we see of Athens she is creeping like a whipped hound at the feet of Rome, alternately licking and biting the hand

of her master. And all this in spite of "the influence of superior education" of the subtlest kind. The 'natural man' was too much for Athens.

But perhaps it will seem to some that our modern culture differs from the standard of the ancient world, by adding an entirely new element. So, for instance, Mr. Huxley thinks: he has not much opinion of the kind of training afforded by Athens. That whole culture by music, geometry, and the general refinement of the nature by the study of the beautiful, he has stigmatized as a "*sensual caterwauling*." He does not do this directly, but indirectly, holding up such unfortunates as Mr. Pater, and Mr. Swinburne, the advocates generally of culture as distinguished from science, as objects of contempt to the well-regulated scientific mind. It is science that makes all the difference in our modern education: we have the Baconian method; we deal with facts; we have learned to teach by "object lessons;" we are not "satisfied with telling our child that a magnet attracts iron. We let him see that it does. And especially tell him that it is his duty to doubt until he is compelled by the absolute authority of Nature, to believe that which is written in books;" and by "the authority of Nature" we mean what can be tested by weights, and retorts, and crucibles, what we can see, or feel, or weigh. This is the grand secret of the modern "superior education." Far be it from us to say any thing disrespectful of the study of the natural sciences. The habit of mind induced by the scrutiny of nature in the modern methods, is one that has been productive of the greatest benefits. It has been a training for exactness, reality, sobriety. But what we say is, that even this is no cure for the 'natural man.'

It is useless to discuss the question on *a priori* grounds, though one is tempted to follow out the line of Mr. Tyndall's last words on the doctrine of Necessity, thus:—given the doctrine that man is so thoroughly a part of nature that he *must* do whatever he does, and given this teaching as a part of "superior education," what will be the result of such indoctrination when filtered down to the average man? But

let us keep to the facts. What has modern education of the higher sort done to fortify virtue, to make man humble and gentle and kind and just? It is rather early to look for very decided results. Religion still holds the field: she tinctures the thoughts of men, not only by the influence she exerts through the religious part of the cultivated world, but also by the hold through association, and the old education she still has on those who have professedly turned their backs on her. Mr. Huxley, and Prof. Clifford, and Mr. Morley, and all the apostles of the gospel of scientific enlightenment, though they speak so bitterly of religion, are yet full of religious prepossessions and feelings. They have cut loose from God, but they have not destroyed the impetus of that old idea of God in their mental motives. And so they talk in the most edifying way about conscience and duty, and the sacredness of truth, and a number of other things, which on their theories of life are mere questions of "lunar politics," the most unadulterated moonshine.

But already we are beginning to see what the "superior education" that casts off God will come to. In looking for these results, we need not restrict ourselves to the efforts among purely scientific inquirers; for the results of the modern devotion of mind simply to the facts of nature have gone out into every field of thought. The word of the day intellectually is '*we know what we see.*' And art has taken that word, history has taken it, philosophy has taken it: it is the watchword of the whole camp of modern culture. So when we look for the fruits of that spirit, we go throughout the whole domain of culture to find them.

If there is any doctrine of morals that seems to belong pre-eminently to our age, it is that of benevolence, charity, love. No age of the world has ever been so saturated with the feeling for man. It seems to be in the air: and if any doctrine of morals could live without root in religion, that, we say, would be the one. We have all become so afraid of inflicting pain, that it seems sometimes as if there were danger of society going to pieces for the difficulty there is in getting the very worst offender punished. But we find in the influ-

ence of "superior education" a current setting the other way. The philosophers do not believe in philanthropy. Mr. Emerson indignantly disavows the name: he does not love men: he would be ashamed of himself if he did. A great English law writer says explicitly, that he does not love any but respectable people, that if he had his way he would write his hatred and contempt of the great mass of men with the lash on their backs. M. Renan, the leader of culture in France, lays out a plan for the organization of the future, in which only the choice spirits are to have the good things, and the mass are to be satisfied with looking on at the happiness and glory of their betters, like poor street children flattening their noses against the glass, while they watch well-dressed gentlemen and ladies eating the beef and pudding within. Nor are these only names singled out by their eccentricity from a general mass that goes the other way. The disgust and impatience with the sick, the poor, the feeble, the remnants of society, shown by certain late discussions, all point the same way. We all remember the debate on "*euthanasia*," *i. e.* the expediency of putting persons who have incurable diseases out of their misery. At first it seemed that this was advocated as a mercy to the afflicted persons themselves; and the incurable was only to be put to death by his own consent; but as the discussion went on, it appeared that one great benefit in the minds of the proposers was the relief it would afford to society, to the friends: and then it was questioned whether in certain stages of diseases the mind might not be so affected that the patient was incapable of judging what was best for him, and the decision of life or death be left to his friends. The discussion was a little too much for society, and some strong expressions of disgust hushed the inquiry up. But there was enough of it to show what way our modern "superior education," with religion left out, will tend. Take also the state of mind displayed by the advocates of vivisection in England: it seems to that section of the educated mind of Great Britain which has broken with religion, to be something puerile that the claims of pity, and of the compassionate nature in man should stand in the way of what they are pleased to call the investigation of



truth. Any amount of torture to animals, and of consequent violence to our compassionate sympathy, seems to them nothing compared with the satisfaction of trying experiments on the nature of bile. This seems possibly like detecting a current by the evidence of a very few straws. But then the straws all float the same way. Listen to the tone in which the cultured world, that rejects religion, talks of help extended to the weak, to the incurably sick, to the diseased in mind; its general expression of disbelief in any curative efforts, its general disgust at all moral reform; its unmeasured contempt for the work of Foreign Missions.

All this falls in with the inevitable drift of the doctrine of the *survival of the fittest* applied to life as a universal law. Indeed, if I am persuaded deeply that nature is only a complex sieve, which is eternally sifting out the inferior and garnering the choice, then no amount of inherited instincts, or associated, feelings are going to keep me from gradually making that law of nature my law of conduct. Why should I save what is doomed by nature as unsaveable? My compassion, my unfortunate thin-skinnedness of feeling may make me struggle with the inevitable current for awhile. But my struggles will grow feebler: my faith, (for that is what the belief in evolution really is), my faith in this all-embracing law that goes on casting out the poor and weak, must at last mould my conduct. And it ought to do so. If there be any validity in one's sense of duty, there is no escape from it that we must follow what we see to be the line of truth; and if nature is slowly bolting the grain of life, throwing out the chaff of the weak, the sick, the ignorant, and saving only the wheat, then it is not only useless for me to seek to reserve the chaff, it is wicked. Prof. Clifford and Mr. Morley would say, yes, to this, I think. Mr. Huxley and Mr. Tyndall would not say so yet; but it is hard to see how they can escape from going over the falls now they have got into the rapids. As for Pres. Eliot and Pres. Gilman, of course they indignantly disavow such principles; but those that occupy their chairs in the next generation, if they have got all their culture only from their "superior education," will not dis-



vow them so emphatically. If you want to know what fruit doctrine bears, do not examine the lives of the original teachers, but those of their pupils.

But there is another class of mind which applies the "superior education" in another direction, that is just as fatal to all hope of curing the natural man by the influence of a higher culture. One of the most curious signs of the times is the reproduction of the old Greek paganism among us; the philosophy of the Garden, that true wisdom is to get the most we can out of this life in the way of enjoyment, regardless of all else; "*carpe diem*." And this too is the outcome of our modern scientific thought, cut loose from God. Mr. Huxley and his severe scientific friends may kick against it as much as they please, but there it is, Mr. Pater, and the school he so exquisitely represents, are the children of the phenomenal philosophy: "You know only phenomena, what you see and feel; you cannot know the eternal; you must be satisfied with the visible;"—so Mr. Huxley and Mr. Tyndall, and then under the influence of a strong taste for the investigation of natural facts, they continue, "let us go on to find out more truth, and to tell others." But at Mr. Huxley's elbow stands Mr. Pater; he hears this dictum, that we have only the present; we know only phenomena; and he says, well then let us enjoy the present. Mr. Huxley may go on investigating, experimenting, discovering natural laws; let him if he likes it. But, says Mr. Pater, I will enjoy: "While all melts under our feet, we may well catch at any exquisite passion, or any contribution to knowledge that seems, by a lifted horizon, to set the spirit free for a moment, or any stirring of the senses, strange dyes, strange flowers, and curious odors, or work of artistic hands. With this sense of the splendor of our experience and of its awful brevity, gathering all we are into one desperate effort to see and touch, we shall hardly have time to make theories about the things we see and touch. \* \* The theory, or idea, or system, which requires of us the sacrifice of any part of this experience, in consideration of some interest into which we cannot enter, or some

abstract morality we have not identified with ourselves, or what is only conventional, has no real claim upon us."

I am afraid Mr. Huxley and his scientific friends will call this only 'sensual caterwauling:' it does sound, I confess, rather sensual, rather selfish; it is only paganism;—"live while you live;"—"let us eat, drink and be merry; to-morrow we die." But what is to be observed is that it is one actual inference from the reigning philosophy of the schools. And when this "superior education," which teaches men of facts, of the visible, of this present course of things, disconnected from God, from any hereafter, or any day of accounts, disconnected from conscience as a supernatural and authoritative voice within the soul,—when such education, I say, sends down its influence to touch the natural man, what power will it have to check in him the restless, indefatigable impulse to gratify the present feelings, to go wrong, to be base, brutal, lustful, selfish? If Mr. Pater and Mr. Swinburne, and the rest of our exquisitely refined, and acuminate gentlemen, all say let us gather "all we are into one desperate effort to see and touch," what will the average natural man say? Will he say, "let us pay our debts like honest men?" Why, if Mr. Pater declines to sacrifice any part of this experience of enjoyment, in consideration of "some abstract morality," shall we expect the silver man to tax himself 10 per cent. more to gratify such an abstract bit of morality as the maintenance of the national honor?

If the "superior education" were to be tried, so to speak, in a moral vacuum, if there were no predisposing elements at work, then the dream of making it a moral governor might have some plausibility. But there is no vacuum: the ground is pre-occupied; the natural man is strongly moved to go in a wrong direction; he has been going that way a long time; the impulse in him is something tremendous; the whole force, of civilization and of the religion from which that civilization has sprung, have thus far barely availed to hold him in and slowly tame him. Now, let the "superior education," which says religion is only a beautiful fairy story, or as Prof.

Clifford calls it, an ugly superstition, go to him, and taking off the pressure that the belief in an unseen world, in a righteous and Almighty God, in a Judgment to come, and in an eternity of existence, has exerted, apply its restraining influence: let it tell him that the only world we know of is the present, that conscience is a growth of the race's development, that all we have is the present, and yet that he ought to make the most of himself, and live a pure and noble life, and what will be the effect? As a great writer says: "If we should ever see a generation of men, to whom the word God had no meaning at all, we should get a light upon the subject which might be lurid enough."

I have said what I wish to say. Of course Pres. Eliot and Pres. Gilman do not care for such consideration. They, and their fellow-laborers in the cause of secular education have their experience to try, and try it they will to the end. But we who believe in "superior education," we Christian teachers, who in the persons of those who have preceded us through the long generations of the past, have loved the light and sought it, wherever it was to be found, who have cherished it and kept its lamp from being blown out through dark ages, when Christianity was the sole guardian and lover of truth of any kind, we who rejoice in the great sweep of advancement, that the race is making in the knowledge of God's natural world, and who say to Science, "Go on, discover all you can, of the mechanism of this cosmos," we may say, when you unfasten education from the knowledge of God, then you give up the hope of the future. Nothing has ever yet tamed the natural man, but the fear of God; we do not believe anything else ever will.

## ARTICLE IX.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

## AMERICAN.

**BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.**—*Manual of Systematic Theology and Christian Ethics*, by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D.; *The Seven Words from the Cross*, by W. H. Adams; *Orthodoxy*, Boston Monday Lectures, by Jos. Cook; *The Christian Creed*, its Theory and Practice, with a Preface on some Present Dangers of the English Church, by Rev. S. Leathes; *Masters in English Theology*, being the Kings College Lectures for 1877, ed. with a historical Preface by A. Barry, D. D.; *A Popular Exposition of the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia*, by H. E. Plumptre; *Daniel the Beloved*, by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D.; *All Saints' Day*, and other Sermons, by Rev. Chas. Kingsley, M. A., ed. by W. Harrison, M. A.; *The New Testament Commentary* for English Readers, by Various Writers, ed. by Chas. J. Ellicott, D. D., in three vols., vol. I.; *Home Life in Ancient Palestine*, Studies on the Book of Ruth, by Rev. A. Thomson, D. D.; *The Natural History of Atheism*, by Prof. J. S. Blackie; *Eternal Hope*, Five Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey, 1877, by Rev. F. W. Farrar.

**SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.**—*Elements of Geology*, a Text-Book for Colleges and for the general reader, by Jos. Le Conte, illus.; *Biology*, by Charles Letourneau, (vol. 2. Contemp. Science Ser.); *Comparative Psychology*, or the Growth and Grades of Intelligence, by John Bascom; *Popular Astronomy*, by Simon Newcomb, LL. D., 112 engravings and 5 maps; *Anthropology*, by Dr. Paul Topinard, with a Preface by Prof. Paul Broca, translated by Robt. T. H. Bartley, M. D., illus. (Library of Contemp. Science, vol. 3); *A Manual of the Anatomy of the Invertebrated Animals*, by Thos. H. Huxley; *The Ancient Life-History of the Earth*, a Comprehensive Outline of the Principles and Leading Facts of Palaeontological Science, by H. Alleyne Nicholson, M. D., illus.; *The Epoch of the Mammoth, and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth*, by Jas. C. Southall, illus.

**HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.**—*Democracy in Europe*, by Thos. Erskine May, 2 vols.; *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*, by R. W. Church, (Epoch of Modern History) with 3 maps; *History of the English People*, by John R. Green, M. A., vol. I.; *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, by Wm. E. H. Lecky, 2 vols.; *The Life and Times of Thomas Becket*, by Jas. A. Froude; *History of Germany from the Earliest Times*, by Charlton T. Lewis; *A History of Latin Literature*, by Leonard Schmitz, LL. D.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Dictionary of English Literature*, being a comprehensive Guide to English Authors and their works, by W. Davenport Adams; *The Coming Empire*, or Two Thousand Miles in Texas on Horse-back, by H. F. McDaniel and N. A. Taylor; *Pascal*, by Rev. Principal Tulloch, vol. 3, of Foreign classics for English Readers; *Between the Gates* by Benj. F. Taylor, author of "Songs of Yesterday," "Old Pictures," "World on Wheels," &c., with illustrations.

## BRITISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Basis of Faith*, Congregational Union Lectures, 1877, by E. R. Conder; *Seven Topics of the Christian Faith*, by P. Maclaren; *Four Gospels as Interpreted* by the Early Church, by F. H. Dunwell; *Bible Plants*, their History, etc., by J. Smith.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Miscellaneous Papers connected with Physical Science*, by H. Lloyd.

HISTORICAL.—*History of Civilization in Scotland*, by J. Macintosh, vol. I.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*History of English Humor*, by A. G. L'Estrange, 2 vols., octavo; *Classic Preachers of the English Church*, lectures delivered at St. James's Church, with Introduction by J. E. Kempe; *Lapland Life*, or Summer Adventures in Arctic Regions, by D. D. Mackintosh; *Etymological Glossary* of nearly 2500 English words from the Greek, by E. J. Boyce.

## GERMAN.

BIBLICAL.—*The Book of Job*, by Rev. W. Rogge, 120 pages, is a popular exposition of this book for the people. The same book has been put into German verse by Rev. G. Kemmler, in a volume entitled *Job, or Conflict and Victory in Suffering*. pp. 184. *The Idea of the Atonement in the Old Testament*, is a small volume, 88 pp., by Prof. Dr. Riehm, and is a reprint from the Studien und Kritiken.

In Meyer's critical exegetical Commentary on the N. T., the fourth edition of the commentary on 1 & 2 Eps. of Peter, and on Jude, by Dr. Huther, and the third edition of that on Revelation, by Dr. Duesterdieck, have appeared. These are revised editions. The important literature on these books which appeared since the last edition, is carefully considered.

*The Idolatry and Enchantments of the ancient Hebrews and neighboring Nations*, by Prof. Dr. Scholz. pp. 482. The book treats of the origin of Idolatry and then discusses the subject of the title. It is the result of much research, and besides the views of the author contains much material gathered from various sources.

*The History of Creation*, by Prof. Dr. Pfaff, pp. 753, discusses the scientific theories on this subject and also the account in Genesis.

**HISTORICAL.**—*History of the Christian Dogmas*, by Prof. Dr. Thomasius. 2 volumes, pp. 594 and 484. The first volume, which treats of the history of the dogmas of the early Church, appeared in 1864. The learned author died in Jan. 1875, before the second volume, on the history of doctrines in the Middle Ages and the Reformation could appear. The editing of this volume was therefore committed to his pupil, Dr. Plitt. The entire work is now complete. Thomasius regarded this as his favorite literary production, and for thirty years gathered the materials for it. The work is a lasting monument of the author's great learning and indefatigable research.

*The Romish Church in the Nineteenth Century*, by Prof. F. Nielsen. Translated from the Danish by A. Michelsen. vol. I., pp. 533. This is one of the many works occasioned by the recent political aggressions of the papacy. This volume gives the history of the papacy in this century, the second volume is to give the inner life in that church. The work is of a popular character.

*The Ev. Lutheran Church of Russia*, by Rev. F. Hunnius. pp. 132. This book gives a brief historical sketch and statistical view of the Lutheran Church in Russia. In that land there are, according to this volume, 4,024,035.

*John Damascenus*, by J. H. F. Grundlehner. pp. 255. In the first part the author gives an account of the life of Damascenus, in the second an account of his literary activity as systematic theologian, apologist, homilist, and hymnologist.

*History of the City of Cologne*, by Dr. Ennen. vol. iv. pp. 889. This vol. gives the history of the city during the Reformation.

*The Reformation in the ecclesiastical Province of Cologne*, by Rev. Drouven. pp. 409.

J. H. W. S.

## ARTICLE X.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

J. M. STODDART & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

*The Encyclopædia Britannica*. A Dictionary of the Arts, Sciences, and General Literature. Ninth Edition, (American Reprint). Vol. vii. pp. 721. 1878.

This is the seventh volume of this truly learned and valuable work. It comprehends the subjects within the Alphabetical range from Deacon to El Dorado, and includes not only a rich variety, but also many articles of great interest and importance. A goodly number of subjects are treated with a fullness that is most satisfactory. It is difficult to give any clear view of the contents of such a volume in a notice such as is common to a *Review*. We have been impressed with

the value of the articles in this volume on some leading subjects, a few of which may be mentioned. In *Biography* there is an array of such names as Defoe, Demosthenes, De Quincey, Descartes, Dickens, Diderot, Dryden, Dumas, etc., etc., and the articles seem to have been written by authors in sympathy with their subjects.

*Geography* and *History* are well represented. Egypt, with a fine map, occupies more than seventy pages. Delhi, Denmark, Dublin, Edinburgh, are among the articles under this head.

*Science* and *Art* receive special attention. The article on the *Distribution* of Life, Animal and vegetable, in Space and Time, covers thirty pages, and that on the Drama more than forty. Under *Education* the educational theories are traced from the earliest times to the present day, and much valuable matter furnished. The Theological and Biblical departments have not been overlooked. There are articles on Decalogue, Deism, Dogmatic, Ecclesiastes, etc. That on the Decalogue is by Prof. Smith, of the Free Church College, Aberdeen, whose article on the Bible, in a former volume, has caused so much controversy, and subjected the author to an ecclesiastical trial for his opinions on the Scriptures. The article on Dogmatic is one of the best in this department.

These are only mentioned as samples or illustrations of the character of the articles in this volume. Indeed as we turn over its pages we wonder at the research and industry displayed in its preparation. Nothing but the combined labors of a large number of contributors, each of whom has made a specialty of his field could produce a work like this. It will be a library in itself, and many a scholar, of fair acquirements has not in his whole library as much valuable literary and scientific material as will be found in this one real Encyclopædia. Our appreciation of its value increases with the appearance of the successive volumes, and the opportunities for further examination and consultation.

Notwithstanding the care so apparent in the preparation of the articles, we notice an occasional slip. In the very valuable article on "Denmark," accompanied by a well executed map, we find the following: "Of the 2088 persons who left Denmark in 1875, 1678 emigrated to the United States of America, 329 to Australia, 47 to Canada, and 34 to other points of America, including the Salt Lake City." Our English cousins should know that Uncle Sam claims Salt Lake City as included in the territory of "the United States of America." The article on "Dictionary," has a most formidable array of works in that department, in various languages ancient and modern, but our attention has been called to the omission under the heading "Latin" of so well known a work as Ramshorn's Latin Synonyms, and in "Greek" of Damm's Homeric Lexicon. But of nearly every thing this Encyclopædia treats, and there is not much that it does not touch, it is

a treasury. It is to be hoped that the enterprising publisher will be liberally rewarded for furnishing this neat and cheap "American Reprint."

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

*The Epoch of the Mammoth, and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth.*

By James C. Southall, A. M., LL. D., Author of the "Recent Origin of Man." With Illustrations. pp. xv., 430. 1878.

The author of this volume, Dr. James C. Southall, of Richmond, Va., had become pretty well known, both in this country and in England, by the publication, a few years ago, of his work on the "Recent Origin of Man." It came as a summons to halt, in the wild and visionary theories which professed scientists were offering to the world, in the name of true science; and asked attention to plain and simple facts. Even the journals that had been foremost in heralding the new and popular views, admitted the vast amount of research and learning displayed, and gave significant indications that it was time to consider more carefully some of the conclusions hastily reached. It is not too much to say that there has already been a reaction, if not to the old interpretation of the Bible, at least to a much nearer approach to it than many were disposed to advocate a few years ago.

The drift of this volume is in the same general direction with that on the "Recent Origin of Man." The design is thus stated by the author himself: "The object of the present volume is to give in a compact form all that the investigations of the students of geology and prehistoric archaeology have brought to light with regard to 'man's age in the world.'" It embraces, besides an interesting Preface, twenty-five chapters, with Addenda and a very full Index. This last mentioned particular makes the volume especially easy and valuable for consultation on particular points. The volume indicates great familiarity with the subject on the part of the author. He subjects to a critical examination some of the alleged facts and theories founded on them, and shows how utterly unscientific and untrustworthy they are. Sir Charles Lyell's 800,000 years, for the antiquity of man on the earth, which he himself had cut down to 200,000, suffers a further shrinkage until only a few thousand are left with any show of proof, Dr. Dowler's skeleton found in the river mud at New Orleans, and for which he claimed a period of 57,000 years, is shown to have no data requiring any such length of time. Other remains for which a fabulous period has been argued, are proved by simple facts not to ante-date a very few thousand years. It is indeed surprising how hundreds of thousands of years vanish before the touch of a few simple facts, and splendid theories are left without any support.

Special importance seems to be attached in this volume to the Glacial Age, and the Epoch of the Mammoth. They have been em-



ployed by others to prove a great antiquity for man on the earth. Dr. Southall seems to demonstrate the recent date of the Glacial Age, and also to prove the comparatively recent existence of the mammoth. His facts and arguments certainly go far towards overthrowing the opposite views. No one can read the volume without feeling that he is following a patient and candid guide, and who would not willingly lead him into error. The closing chapter, on the "Antiquity of Man in America," will be of special interest to American readers. The volume does honor to the distinguished author, and will doubtless aid the cause of scientific truth. It will at the same time tend to confirm our faith in the teaching of the Bible. There is no place in this volume for the modern theory of evolution, or the existence of man for countless ages on this earth.

It is due to the publishers to say that the volume is brought out in excellent style. The illustrations are well executed, and the whole mechanical part of the work substantial and attractive.

*Foreign Classics for English Readers.* Edited by Mrs. Oliphant. *Pascal*, by Principal Tulloch. pp. 205.

Few authors have received higher or more undisputed praise than Pascal. He has an unquestioned right to the very highest honors as a profound thinker and polished writer. But it may well be doubted whether he is read in any proportion to the praise bestowed on him. Many are content to express their admiration without knowing why, or with scarcely having read enough of him to form an opinion. One reason for this is the profound character of much of his thinking; and another may be the want of popular accessible editions of his works. The design of this little volume is to introduce, or—if he does not need introduction—to make the mass of English readers better acquainted with Pascal. It gives, although not very full, an interesting sketch of his life, accompanied with extracts from his various writings. These extracts will serve to show the cast of his mind and the character of his compositions. The volume belongs to the series of "Foreign Classics for English Readers," and is in every way attractive. In an age not specially distinguished for profound sober thought on moral and religious questions, this publication will aid in directing attention to the loftiest and most important themes.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

*The Natural History of Atheism*, by John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek at the University of Edinburgh. pp. 253. 1878.

Almost anything from the pen of Professor Blackie is sure to attract attention, at least in certain quarters, and to secure readers. His poetic temperament and classic learning, with a wealth of imag-

ery and expression, make him a favorite author with those who can appreciate the charm of such a writer. A new volume from him is hailed with pleasing anticipations. But those who expect, from the title of this volume, a theological, or philosophical, or critical, or historical treatment of Atheism, will experience a measure of disappointment. The volume certainly has some good things in it, but it does not rise to "the height of this great argument," or handle such a theme as it deserves. Indeed, we think, that the author can hardly be said to have seriously grappled with his subject at all. He has satisfied himself with skirmishing with this dread, black foe of God and man.

The volume contains six chapters on the subjects of: PRESUMPTIONS; THEISM, ITS REASONABLE GROUND; ATHEISM, ITS VARIETIES AND COMMON ROOT; POLYTHEISM; BUDDHISM; THE ATHEISM OF REACTION; MODERN ENGLISH ATHEISTS AND AGNOSTICS; MARTINEAU AND TYNDALL. Atheism is defined as "a disease of the speculative faculty which must be expected to reappear from time to time, when men are shaken out of the firm forms of their old beliefs, and have not yet had time to work themselves into the well-defined mould of a new one." We are satisfied, with Professor Blackie and Plato, to consider Atheism a disease, but we are not sure that its seat is in the speculative faculty. In the second and third chapters, which treat more specifically of THEISM and ATHEISM, the author utters some bold truths in regard to Atheism. He has very little respect for the pretensions of Atheism, and holds it in deserved abhorrence; yet is hardly consistent with his own definition in viewing it in its different phases "as proceeding from the want of a root of reverence in the soul." This is not so much speculative as moral and practical.

The chapters on POLYTHEISM and BUDDHISM are more extended, embracing nearly half of the entire volume, and contain very interesting discussions and criticisms. Those who have never looked at Buddhism will probably be surprised at his statements and applications.

There is a good deal in the last chapter, on THE ATHEISM OF REACTION, against which we must enter a strong demurrer. What, for instance, will sober critics say of a Greek professor uttering the following? "It does not require any very profound scholarship to know that the word *αἰώνιος*, which we translate EVERLASTING, does not signify eternity absolutely and metaphysically: but only popularly, as when we say that a man is an eternal fool, meaning only that he is a very great fool!!! For the reputation of Professor Blackie we could wish he had never uttered this, or could blot it out. Place along side of it the profound and scholarly discussion of such terms by Tayler Lewis, who knew quite as much of Greek as Professor Blackie, and we are impressed with the thoughtful, reverent scholar, as compared with this flippant Grecian of Edinburgh. Canon Farrar will take

courage at such utterances, but it may well be doubted whether they do not tend to irreligion and Atheism.

His charge against "a class of Christian ministers in the Scottish Highlands specially amongst the clergy of the Free Church," who are opposed to "dancing, and singing, and cards and theatres," as if they were by the power of REACTION producing Atheism, will hardly more commend itself to serious and thoughtful minds. There may sometimes be an excess of rigor inculcated, and as a question of expediency we are willing that Professor Blackie shall hold his own views on such subjects. But to insinuate that the ministers of a Church that boasts a Chalmers, a Guthrie, and an Arnot, all of whom preached against worldly dissipations, is a school to train for Atheism, is simply to betray the prejudice and bigotry of the author in spite of liberal pretensions. It is the old MODERATISM of Scotland and England showing its contempt for a more earnest piety. Sidney Smith called forth the withering invectives of Dr. Chalmers by sneering at the same school of religion. There is much greater danger of fiddling, dancing, whiskey-drinking ministers and elders, or such an one as Professor Blackie says, "it is contrary to his nature not to like a good dinner and to shrink from a glass of good wine"—causing unbelief and Atheism, than that too rigid a piety should. Love for a "glass of good wine," or even bad whiskey, needs no special encouragement in Scotland.

We have been interested in this volume, the subject and the treatment, but scarcely know whether it has most to commend or to censure. There is danger that the loose and scarcely reverent expressions in it will do more harm than the other parts will do good. No doubt Professor Blackie would class us among the "cataphraet theologic" ones who are helping the cause of Atheism by such strictness. Very well, he has had his say, and now we have ours, and we say that he has uttered not a little in this volume that does no credit to himself as a scholar or a professed believer, and that will do no good to the cause he is aiming to serve.

A serious defect in this volume, of a different character, is the want of a good Index. Such a work especially needs one.

*Life and Times of Thomas Becket*, by James Anthony Froude, M. A., pp. 150. 1878.

In this volume the author has given us a very life-like picture of the life and times of Becket. The subject is evidently to his taste, and he tells his story with dramatic affect. We see this bold, obstinate high churchman, Arch-bishop of Canterbury, moving on the stage until his tragic death, and the curtain falls. In painting the corruptions of the church, and the ecclesiastical arrogance of Becket, the historian has failed to give a like coloring to the corruption and

misrule in civil affairs. One is tempted to ask, was the fault all on the side of the Church, or was not much due to the general corruption and degeneracy of the times? It is certainly a dark picture that is here drawn, and it may teach a lesson to those who are continually croaking about the Church and the world growing worse and worse.

It is hardly necessary to commend this volume to those who desire a view of Becket and his times. Any who begin to read it will not care to lay it down until it is finished.

*All Saints' Day and Other Sermons*, by the Rev. Charles Kingsley, M. A., Late Rector of Eversley and Canon of Westminster. Edited by the Rev. W. Harrison, M. A., Rector of Brington. pp. x., 410. 1878.

But few of these sermons were prepared with any idea of their being printed. "They were written out very roughly"—we are told—"sometimes at an hour's notice, as occasion demanded, and were only intended for delivery from the Pulpit." They are hardly fair subjects for criticism on the score of homiletical or literary merit. They certainly cannot rank very high as models of sermons. But they may serve better than his more elaborate discourses to give us an idea of the man and the preacher. They are good specimens of plain, simple, direct address to hearers, and reveal some of the elements of Kingsley's popularity. He had a warm, sympathizing heart, and he carried this into his sermons. There are some lessons to be learned from a reading of this volume, that stilted preachers would do well to study. Their simplicity and directness of address are refreshing.

*Epochs of Modern History. The Beginning of the Middle Ages.* By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's; Honorary Fellow of Oriel. With three Maps. pp. 226.

This is another, and we believe the eleventh, volume of this admirable series of "Epochs of Modern History." But whilst thus far along in the list, we are told that "it must be considered as an introduction or preface to the series." The Introduction treats of the division between ancient and modern history, with a few leading events until the division of the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western, and the invasion of the barbarians. Thence we are carried along till the beginning of the eleventh century. The narrative is necessarily concise, but it will serve to fix in the mind leading events and prepare for a more minute study of these centuries. This volume is unlike the others of the series in this, that whilst they treat of a particular epoch, this one furnishes an outline of many centuries. Three good maps, marking successive periods in the history, a chronological table of ten

pages, and a full Index, add greatly to the value of the work. This series must make the study of history to the young easy and attractive.

HARPER & BROS., NEW YORK.

*Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples.* A narrative of researches and excavations during ten years' residence in that Island. By General Louis Palma Di Cesnola, Mem. of the Royal Academy of Sciences, Turin, Hon. Mem. of the Royal Society of Literature, London, etc. With Maps and Illustrations. pp. xix., 456. 1878.

This is a volume of rare interest and value. There is everything about it to invest it with peculiar attractions. The island of Cyprus, from its very position, has been an object of interest from comparatively early times; and although its very earliest history is obscure, it figures conspicuously in the Grecian wars, and from that time onward. It was deemed of sufficient importance to claim the attention and labors of the first missionaries of Christianity. The Introduction to the volume, covering forty pages, gives an epitome of the history of Cyprus from the earliest times to its subjugation, and incorporation in the Turkish Empire in the sixteenth century. That history is one of almost constant disquietude, with successive revolutions, and disaster following disaster.

General Louis Palma Di Cesnola was appointed Consul at Cyprus by President Lincoln, a few days before his death, and reached his post on Christmas day of that year. How much time he devoted to his Consulship we cannot say, but he certainly employed his leisure well in exploring the island, and has obtained results that will render his name famous in all time, and afford pleasure and instruction to all who are privileged to read his book, or examine his wonderful collection. For ten years General Di Cesnola continued his researches, and this volume contains the account of his marvellous discoveries, with ample illustrations of their character. He prosecuted his labors amid manifold and continued difficulties, interposed by Turkish officials and the worthless character of those whose services he was compelled to use. But in spite of all difficulties, the success was great, and the results must be viewed with admiration. He succeeded in opening ten thousand tombs, and bringing to light their long buried treasures. The number and variety of sculptures, of vases of various descriptions, of personal ornaments, of works of art of all kinds, are truly wonderful. A description of them would be to repeat the contents of this volume, for it is crowded with the simple narrative of these researches and illustrations of the discoveries made. Whilst all are interesting, some are worthy of special note. At Lanarca, among many others, he found a colossal statue of Hercules, eight feet nine inches in height, a photograph of which adorns page 133 of the volume. The

opposite page is adorned with what is supposed to be a statue of a Priest of Venus, only a little less in size. The remains discovered here seem to represent different nations, and among them is an Assyrian statue of life size, and which he succeeded in securing, he tells us, "unmarred even by a scratch." The details of the unearthing and cleaning up of this statue is quite entertaining. It now adorns page 143 of the volume, and the author says: "Of all the statues I discovered, none were so purely Assyrian in character as this." Here we learn that, 'after eleven days of continuous labor with 110 men on a line of sixty feet they had advanced only nine feet toward the centre, yet 228 sculptures had been unearthed.'

At other places corresponding success crowned his labors. The richest variety of treasures rewarded his efforts at Curium. Some fifty pages are crowded with the remains of art, and buried treasures found here. In an Appendix, prepared by Mr. C. W. King, A. M., of Trinity College, Cambridge, we are furnished with a catalogue of the engraved gems found in the treasure vaults of the temple at Curium. We have also in the Appendix a description of the different types of vases found in Cyprus, the inscriptions in different languages, and other valuable information.

No pains or cost seem to have been spared in the publication of this volume. Even the outside displays its character. Without and within it is full of the representations of ancient art and life in Cyprus. The history of bygone centuries is set before us so that we can almost see the living figures. The volume is no dry discussions of theories, or philosophical speculations about the civilization of those times, but an array of discoveries and facts from which we may judge for ourselves. It is eminently a narrative of facts and an exhibition of positive results achieved. These must speak for themselves, and they tell their own story. There is a commendable freedom on the part of the author from extravagant boasting of what he was permitted to see and accomplish. The whole story is told in a very simple, artless, straightforward way, with just enough of personal experience and adventure to impart to it a life-like freshness. It is not a volume to weary one in reading. There is nothing tedious or heavy about it. It is full of interest, full of instruction, and cannot fail to be appreciated.

We have aimed to give a general idea of the volume, and not to attempt a minute criticism of any particular part. It is assumed that everything in the volume is entirely trust-worthy. Its general spirit awakens no suspicion of any attempt to impose on the reader. It has an air of candor and truthfulness that cannot be mistaken, and one feels that he is not reading dreamy speculations. The author has doubtless achieved a success in this volume as well as in his explorations, and the publishers have added their judgment and skill in furnishing a proper casket to hold and convey the rich treasure.

*Popular Astronomy.* By Simon Newcomb, LL. D., Professor U. S. Naval Observatory. With one Hundred and Twelve Engravings, and five Maps of the Stars. pp. xvi., 566. 1878.

Astronomy may be fitly called the "queen of sciences;" it is probably the oldest, as it is undoubtedly the most attractive and the grandest. In all ages, and among nearly all peoples, the character and movements of the heavenly bodies have claimed admiring if not devout attention. It has been felt and freely expressed that the study of Astronomy is elevating and ennobling, eminently adapted to fill the mind with sublime conceptions, and lead the soul to Him who sits enthroned above the heavens.

The progress of this science marks some of the grandest achievements in modern discoveries. The extent and accuracy of the knowledge now possessed of the heavenly bodies, with the laws governing their movements, compared with that possessed by the ancients, is truly wonderful. And yet the field is continually widening, and opening up new wonders to the diligent explorer.

This volume, by Prof. S. Newcomb, illustrates fully what has just been said, and fills a very important place among the vast number of publications on this general subject. The author is well known as one of the devoted students of this Science, and who is contributing his share in different ways to advance its interests. This work will supply just what many intelligent readers desire and need. Most of the works written on Astronomy are so elementary, and often so inaccurate and unsatisfactory, that they serve but little purpose towards even a moderate knowledge of the subject. Others are so learned, and purely scientific, as to be out of the reach of all except the learned few. But this work combines accuracy and genuine scientific knowledge, with such simplicity and popular method of treatment, as will make it acceptable to vast numbers of readers of average scholarship. We cannot do better than to allow the author himself to explain the general drift of his work. "Its main object," he says, "is to present the general reading public with a condensed view of the history, methods, and results of astronomical research, especially in those fields which are of most popular and philosophical interest at the present day, couched in such language as to be intelligible without mathematical study. He hopes that the earlier chapters will, for the most part, be readily understood by any one having clear geometrical ideas, and that the later ones will be intelligible to all." In the prosecution of his plan, "the historic and philosophic sides of the subject have been treated with greater fulness than is usual in works of this character, while the purely technical side has been proportionately condensed."

The work is divided into four parts, which treat consecutively of,  
THE SYSTEM OF THE WORLD HISTORICALLY DEVELOPED; PRACTI-



CAL ASTRONOMY; THE SOLAR SYSTEM; and, THE STELLAR UNIVERSE, to which is added an extended Appendix embracing a large amount of special information on a variety of topics connected with the general subject. There is, as there should be to all works of any importance, an Index, followed by an Addendum on THE SATELLITES OF MARS and EXPLANATION OF THE STAR MAPS, of which latter there are five. There are also one hundred and twelve illustrations scattered through the volume.

This work, as may be gathered from what has been thus briefly said, has been prepared with evident care, and is a most valuable addition to this department of literature and study. We know of no volume of the kind at all equal to it. Others may be more strictly scientific, or treat a single topic with more fulness, but this gives a comprehensive view of the whole field, and mingles the latest scientific methods and results with popularity of treatment.

Too much can hardly be said, of the style in which the work is issued. The very numerous illustrations are not put in to swell the volume, but to answer a real purpose, and they are executed in a manner that is at once attractive and instructive. The stellar maps at the end of the volume are beautiful in their kind. The whole execution is worthy of the subject and its scholarly treatment by Prof. Newcomb. If any who buy this volume are not pleased and instructed, we are sure the fault cannot be with the author or the publishers. They have done their part, and have done it admirably.

*The Khedive's Egypt or the Old House of Bondage under New Masters.*

By Edwin De Leon, Ex-Agent and Consul-general in Egypt. With Illustrations. pp. xii., 435. 1878.

The author asks, in a Preface, "What can any body have to tell us about the Nile-land that has not already been said or sung?" If he has not told us any thing very new, he has managed to give us a very fresh and interesting volume on an old subject. It would be commonplace for us to dwell upon Egypt—to speak of its hoary antiquity, its stupendous pyramids, its wonderful productiveness, the fame of schools and philosophy two thousand years ago. These and many other things, are they not all written in the books, and read by all?

The aim of our author is to give us a view of Egypt as it now is, and as he has had the opportunity of observing for himself, during a residence of many years in an official capacity, and which he left only last April, or less than a year ago. It cannot be questioned that he has enjoyed advantages far beyond travelers, who spend only a few days and then tell us the wonderful things they have seen, the most of which they have seen only in books. Mr. De Leon has seen Egypt, and had an opportunity for studying the subject of which he writes.

He takes us from Southampton, via Gibraltar, Malta, and the Suez



Canal, till he lands us in Cairo. We are then fairly introduced to Egypt, and through successive chapters are led to examine the various aspects of the country and government, founders of the dynasty, the successive rulers and changes effected, the present Khedive and changes now going on, the productions and tillage of the country, education, judicial tribunals, finances and resources, social life, and progress, etc., etc. This is a very meagre and imperfect outline, and suggests but a few of the many subjects touched upon in the volume. There is a number of appendices giving statistical and other information on topics touched upon in the volume. There are also seven illustrations. We cannot say much for these illustrations. They may serve a purpose, but are not in the highest style of the art. We miss anything in the way of an Index. The volume, while respectable in its style of publication, is hardly up to the average standard of the celebrated publishing establishment that issues it. As the author gives his PREFACE in the shape of an APOLOGY, perhaps he and his publishers do not anticipate any very permanent reputation for the volume. And in the constant changes going on it may be that some one else will soon be needed to tell the story of Egypt's ever changing condition. Still Mr. De Leon has done service for the present time, and his book will give a better view of Egypt as it is, than many other works more learned and more pretentious. Designed to be popular in its treatment, it will be read with pleasure and instruction.

*History of the English People* by John Richard Green, M. A., vol. I. Early England, 449—1071: England Under Foreign Kings 1071—1214: The Charter 1204—1291: The Parliament 1307—1461, with Eight Maps. pp. xi., 575. 1878.

The publication by Mr. Green, a few years ago, of his "Short History of the English People," was a remarkable success. It was at once hailed as the most readable, and for the character and design of the work, the most satisfactory in the language. The very general favor with which it was received by learned critics as well as by common readers, has led the author to give it a careful revision, and to publish it in a form still more acceptable for permanent use. Much in the present work is simply what was in the former one, but there are numerous changes and important additions. The authorities are more fully given. Some statements amplified, here and there new matter introduced, and the whole subjected to a revision. This first volume of the American Edition embraces nearly 600 pages, and brings the history down to the middle of the fifteenth century. Whilst the same general order and method of treatment, as in the former work, are observed, it is separated into distinct Books and Chapters, more clearly distinguishing the different parts and marking more distinctly the progress of the narrative. The number of maps is increased and

their character improved. The reader will at once be struck with the more attractive appearance of this work. The other was crowded, a model of compactness in printing—a great work of more than 800 pages pressed into one compact volume of moderate size and small cost: this one is a model of clear, open, attractive looking pages, adding much to the pleasure in reading it. This promises to be the standard history of the English People, and it is well that it is published in so attractive a style. For a general history it will take its place in well selected libraries, and will be read and consulted as an authority. We hail with pleasure this valuable work in its revised form and new dress. It is one of the most important additions to our historical literature.

*Daniel, The Beloved*, by the Rev. W. M. Taylor, D. D., Minister of The Broadway Tabernacle, New York City; author of "Peter the Apostle," "David, King of Israel," "Elijah the Prophet," etc. pp. 245. 1878.

Dr. Taylor is quite well known by his former volumes on some of the leading characters in the Bible. He is turning to good account his studies for the pulpit, and thus securing a larger audience by means of the press. This volume is marked by the same general characteristics as the preceding ones. The author is a reverent student of the Bible, a vigorous writer, and earnest in his presentation of religious truth. He evinces a large share of good, practical, common sense, and looks at religion as a matter that concerns our daily life. The lessons of the Bible are brought to bear on our true way of living.

This volume embraces thirteen discourses on leading topics in the book of Daniel, the first being, "Daniel at College," and the last, "The Character of Daniel." He shows a proper regard for his readers by supplying the volume, though it has a Table of Contents, with an Index. The discourses will be found stimulating and edifying. It were well if more of our preachers, like Dr. Taylor, would carefully study the Bible, with a view of giving the rich results of such study in earnest and substantial discourses to their hearers.

*Our Children's Songs.* With Illustrations. pp. 207. 1878.

This is a charming volume, for children shall we say? no, for all, and especially for the old folks to read to children. It is by far the fullest and best collection that we know of in this line of poetry. It is a real treasury of "Children's Songs." There are many that we have all heard in our childhood, and some of which perhaps few have heard—gathered from fields but little known. It would be silly to criticise this volume on its poetic merits alone or chiefly, although it contains many a gem. It would be as silly to criticise the prattle of infancy by Aristotle's rules, or children's play houses by the plan of

Diana's temple, as to criticise this volume as one would Milton or Tennyson. It is a volume to be read, and sung, and laughed over with children and enjoyed in the home circle—to awaken memories of the past, pleasing associations of the present, and to mellow the autumn of old age. It has something for childhood of every period, even for "the child an hundred years old."

It is arranged into "Songs for the Nursery; Songs for Childhood; Songs for Girlhood; Songs for Boyhood;—Our Children's Sacred Songs. Part I. Hymns for the Nursery; Part II. Hymns for Childhood." About seventy of the poems are illustrated, and there is a complete Index of first lines. Our poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, contributes an "Introductory Song," and we presume we are indebted to him for the taste and skill in the collection. We recommend this volume as one that cannot fail to afford pleasure in the family, and prove a rich source of both enjoyment and improvement. It will help to sweeten home, and bind the sweet influences of childhood around our hearts. A stanza from the "Introductory Song" will serve to illustrate the subject and commend the volume.

"Ah! what would the world be to us  
If the children were no more?  
We should dread the desert behind us,  
Worse than the dark before."

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

*Lost Forever.* By L. T. Townsend, D. D., author of "Credo," "Sword and Garment," "God-Man," "Outlines of Theology," "Arena and Throne," etc. pp. 448.

The various able and well-known volumes which the public have received from the pen of Dr. Townsend, are a recommendation for any new work appearing with his name. They all bear the impress of a vigorous mind and trustworthy scholarship. This volume on Future Punishment is timely, and will be found to furnish a very valuable discussion to those who desire to read upon the subject. The contents are ranged in nine chapters, under the heads: Aversion; Bases; Disclosure; God-Nature; Human Nature; Administration; Judgment; Hell—its king and subjects; Duration; with an Appendix on Universalist Standard Works and Principal Scripture Texts; Orthodox Works on Endless Punishment; Punishment as Related to the Universal Good, and Exposure of the Sins of the Righteous on the Day of Judgment.

The chapter on the Duration of Punishment reviews the several forms of Universalistic teaching, and shows their unsoundness, from the Holy Scriptures and recognized ethical principles. There are a few statements in the work which we cannot accept; but we desire to

commend it as a vigorous presentation of the general orthodox belief of the Church on the subject. It is a book of the kind now needed.

*The Supernatural Factor in Religious Revivals.* By L. T. Townsend, D. D., author of "Credo," etc. pp. 311. 1877.

Dr. Townsend has here given us another interesting book. The object of the work is to present, as impartially as possible, the various facts relating to revivals, to show, in philosophical method, the more obvious proper deductions, and to test the modern revival and religious methods. It is divided into five parts. 1. Facts of Human Nature and Human Appliances. 2. Deductions from a Survey of Religious Revivals. 3. Deductions from individual Religious Experience. 4. Evangelists and Revival Agencies, and 5, The Boston Tabernacle. The supernatural element in these special awakenings is clearly traced.

The author writes in warm sympathy with revivals, and approves of well-directed and earnest effort made to promote them. He approves, too, of the method of evangelistic work, so prominently represented in these late days in the labors of Moody and Sankey. Radical ground is taken in favor of the admission of women to "the platform and the pulpit." Dr. Townsend, however, sees and warns against the abuses and perversions of the revival system. Various questions are raised, in the course of this discussion, on which a wide difference of view is found among Christian ministers, and many who agree with him in the fundamental fact of a supernatural factor in revivals, will have to dissent entirely from some views of them here presented.

*The Historical Student's Manual,* by Alfred Waters. Octavo. pp. 7.

This is a most excellent manual for the reader of modern history to keep open for use on his table. It is meant to show, at a glance, the duration of the reign of all the ENGLISH monarchs, and that of their contemporaries of FRANCE, GERMANY, and of the PAPACY, from the invasion of William "the Conqueror" to the present time. CELEBRATED EVENTS of each period are given in place, printed in red ink for convenience of the eye. The use of this inexpensive chart will greatly aid the student in the related chronology of the various historical periods and events.

*The Telephone: an Account of the Phenomena of Electricity, Magnetism, and Sound, as involved in its Action. With Directions for Making a Speaking Telephone.* By Prof. A. E. Dolbear, Tufts College, author of "The Art of Projecting," etc. pp. 128. 1877.

Great interest has been awakened by the wonders of the Telephone, and this small book explanatory of its structure and the scientific principles involved, will meet a general want. As was necessary to enable the reader to understand the instrument, the author has given

a brief, but satisfactory account of the phenomena of electricity, magnetism, and sound. By help of cuts he explains the inter-action of these several factors, and the methods of their application in the structure of the Telephone. Different Telephones are figured and explained, with a full description of and directions for making the Speaking Telephone of which Prof. Dolbear is himself the inventor.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

*Between the Gates.* By Benj. F. Taylor, author of "Songs of Yesterday," "Old-Time Pictures," "World on Wheels," "Camp and Field," etc. With Illustrations. pp. 292. 1878.

These sketches of a trip to California are almost indescribable. They are graphic and racy. They are sunny, eccentric, brilliant, full of commingled beauty and grotesque humor. The poem which forms the preface, "The Overland Train," exhibits the imagination and power of a true poet. The various chapters, on almost all points of California scenery and life, are very entertaining, throwing out many practical truths in rare and humorous representations. There is, we think, an excess of effort on the writer's part to use old and extravagant similes. It sometimes sacrifices literary excellence for the sake of what is simply comical.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*The Ancient Life-History of the Earth.* A Comprehensive Outline of the Principles and Leading Facts of Palaeontological Science. By H. Alleyne Nicholson, M. D., D. Sc., M. A., Ph. D., (Gött), F. R. S. E., F. L. S., Professor of Natural History in the University of St. Andrews. pp. 407. 1878.

Prof. Nicholson is an acknowledged authority in the department in which he writes. A work from his pen, presenting the facts of Palaeontological Science in its present stage of progress, must at once take its place as a recognized standard in this study. The design and scope of the work is best indicated from the Preface: "In a former work, the Author has endeavored to furnish a summary of the more important facts of Palaeontology, regarded strictly in its scientific aspect as a mere department of the great science of Biology. The present work on the other hand, is to attempt to treat Palaeontology more especially from its historical side, and its more intimate relation to Geology. In accordance with this object, the introductory portion of the work is devoted to a consideration of the general principles of Palaeontology, and the bearing of this science upon various geological problems. \* \* \* The second portion deals exclusively with Historical Palaeontology, each formation being considered sep-

arately, as regards its lithological nature and subdivisions, its relations to other formations, its geographical distribution, its mode of origin, and its characteristic life-forms."

Upon the point in controversy between the geological theories of Catastrophism and Continuity, Prof. Nicholson believes "the balance of evidence decisively in favor of some theory of CONTINUITY." In this he differs somewhat from Prof. De Conte and Mr. Clarence King, who recognize catastrophistic action more prominently, on the ground of evidences furnished especially in the more recent investigations of American Geology. On the related point of "Evolution," the author holds that "the evidence of Palaeontology is in favor of the view that the succession of life-forms upon the globe has been to a large extent regulated by some orderly and constantly-acting law of modification and evolution. \* \* \* On the other hand, there are facts which point clearly to the existence of some law other than that of evolution, and probably of a deeper and more far-reaching character. Upon no theory of Evolution can we find a satisfactory explanation of the constant introduction throughout geological time of new forms of life, which do not appear to have been preceded by pre-existent allied types."

The work breathes the true scientific spirit—calm and reverent—and must be classed with the important and most valuable of recent scientific publications.

W. J. MIDDLETON, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*Democracy in Europe: A History.* By Sir Thomas Erskine May, K. C. B., D. C. L., author of "The Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III., 1760—1871." In Two Volumes. pp. 495 and 552. 1878.

Few subjects present a study of greater importance and more abiding interest than the progress of liberty and free government. It is full of great questions, in which men generally are deeply and increasingly concerned. Upon these questions the two fine volumes that form the work before us are meant to throw light. The work will be found to be one of the most valuable additions that have, for some years, been made to the literature of this great subject. The author possesses peculiar qualifications for a task of the kind here executed. He has long and carefully studied the principles and mechanism of popular government. His "Parliamentary Laws and Practice," a standard of English usage, and his "Constitutional History of England," have secured him a recognized position among able writers. He has lived through a period remarkable for the progress of democratic ideas. He has been constantly and closely connected with public affairs, mostly in the House of Commons, where he has sat

carefully observing this progress, like Canute watching the rising tide. Few men could be better prepared to discuss European democracy.

Sir Erskine May has used the term 'Democracy' in this work, not in the strict signification of the sovereignty of the whole people, but in a more comprehensive sense, as embracing every degree of popular power or political liberty, whether in a constitutional monarchy or in a republic. In treating the subject, he has adopted the only method at all likely to yield satisfactory results. Eschewing theories, he examines the subject in the illumination of historical facts—tracing the teaching that is to be read in the actual experiences through which the advance of political freedom has taken place. He has presented the principles of liberty and popular government in their historic forms and practical working, rather than in abstract statements and elaborate discussions.

The work opens with an extended introductory discussion, pointing out the various influences that promote or hinder freedom and popular government, the relations of moral, social and physical conditions, the bearing of climates, and geographical peculiarities, of religions and commerce, of race and education. The first chapter presents the general contrast between the Eastern and Western civilizations and the remarkable absence of free government from the countries of Asia, except in the theocratic federal republic founded by the Jews. The second and third chapters trace the history and discuss the principles of liberty and democratic institutions in Greece. Two chapters are devoted to the fortunes of republican or popular government among the Romans. The sixth chapter is occupied with the Dark Ages and the Revival, bringing us to the great quickening of free thought and popular power through the Reformation. The seventh chapter discusses the Italian Republics. The remaining two, of the first volume, sketch the political history of liberty-loving Switzerland. The second volume brings the Netherlands, France, and England under extended and elaborate reviews.

This outline is sufficient to indicate the compass and value of the work. The author writes from the standpoint of ardent admiration for the English Constitution, which seems to be about his ideal of a justly balanced free government. He shows the glow of an earnest interest in the great subject. His style is admirable—vigorous, fresh, and transparent. While, on various questions that crowd his pages, there are some views open to objection, the work is marked by a most discriminating and sound judgment. We think he has failed to represent justly, however, the influence of Christianity on the development of free institutions in the later centuries of the Middle Ages. Corrupt as the Church was, and identified with despotisms, there yet, probably, came out of the great doctrines she taught and the life she quickened more influence for freedom than her special adverse teach-



ings and repressions exerted AGAINST it. We are surprised to find reference made to so worthless an authority as Draper's "Conflict between Religion and Science." But the faults of the work, we believe, are few and small, and its excellences varied and great. His plan, restricting his inquiry to European nations, has not included the instructive lessons to be learned from the action of democratic principles in our own country; but from his chosen field of the old world, he has brought together, in admirable order, rich material for the comparative study of the principles of free government and human progress.

*On the Study of Words.* Lectures addressed (originally) to the Pupils at the Diocesan Training-School, Winchester, by Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. From the latest revised English Edition. With an Exhaustive Analysis, Additional Words for illustration, and Questions for Examination. By Thomas D. Supplée, Head Master of St. Augustines College, Benecia, California. pp. 395. 1878.

Dean Trench's book "On the Study of Words" has been too long and favorably known to the public to need either description or endorsement. Prof. Supplée has here adapted it most admirably for use in the school-room as a text-book. He has added a complete and exhaustive analysis of the revised text, a set of questions designed to call out the facts in the discussions, and also, at the end of each lecture, a list of other words to encourage original study on the part of the pupil. The new arrangement and additions cannot fail to be of great assistance both to the teacher and the student.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

*A History of Latin Literature.* By Leonard Schmitz, LL. D., Classical Examiner in the University of London. pp. 262.

This small volume meets a felt want in the schools and colleges of the country. Dr. Schmitz has justly thought it strange that there should not exist in our language "a concise general history of Latin Literature that might be put into the hands of young students, and give them a succinct history of its treasures, of its gradual development and ultimate decay." He supplies the need, and supplies it well, in this little work. He has not confined himself to those parts of Latin Literature which are still extant, or even to those writers deservedly held to be classical and read in schools and universities, but has given a complete, though brief, survey of the whole domain of literature, from its rudest beginnings down to the time when the Latin language lost its original character, as a spoken tongue, in the modern languages of Italy, France, and Spain. No kind of literary production has been excluded—even grammars, school-books and technical works. The specific Christian writers of the early cen-



turies are included. The writers, with their works, are arranged in periods, after the general plan of W. S. Teuffel's "Geschichte der Römischen Literatur." A feature of value is the naming of one or two good editions of every author, in foot-notes. The work will form an admirable manual for students in Academies and Colleges, and a book of convenient reference in libraries generally.

JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

*Boston Monday Lectures. Orthodoxy, with Preludes on Current Events.* By Joseph Cook. pp. 343. 1878.

This is the THIRD VOLUME of these now famous lectures. In the January number of the REVIEW we expressed our judgment of the merits of the two volumes on Biology and Transcendentalism; and we find no occasion in this volume to alter the general judgment there expressed. The present volume is rather a continuation of the subjects begun in the previous one, and is marked by the same peculiarities of thought and style. It would be as ridiculous to decry Mr. Cook's talents and attainments, as it would be to set him up as a model of careful, profound investigation, or of correct and chaste composition. The fact is Mr. Cook presents a great many important truths, and has a way of putting them that is often very striking. At the same time he is frequently very extravagant in his expressions, and gives utterance to much that, when read coolly and pondered, cannot commend itself to one's sober judgment. The lectures will doubtless do good, but more as popular lectures than as profound discussions of momentous themes. As this volume has taken the name of ORTHODOXY—on what ground we hardly know—we feel disposed to repeat our unwillingness to be judged by such a standard. It seems to us that Mr. Cook has ventured on some church questions, as well as on some intricate points in theology, that he would better leave to more experienced hands. In such a fight with rationalism and infidelity it is not wise to assume doubtful positions, or positions of antagonism to old and cherished views. Mr. Cook has an undoubted right to combat error wherever he may find it, and, as he professes to know nothing but the truth, to be very bold in his assertions. Still it may be that some other men who have studied the same subjects have opinions as worthy of consideration as his, and it were well not to be too dogmatic. We commend the volumes for the amount of truth they contain, but ask that what we understand by ORTHODOXY be not held responsible for all Mr. Cook's utterances.

*Iowa und Missouri.* Eine Vertheidigung der Lehrstelling der Synode von Iowa gegenüber den Angriffen des Herrn Prof. Schmidt. Von Sigmund und Gottfried Fritschel, Professor am theol. Seminar Wartburg zu Mendota, Ill. pp. 221. 1878.

This is a vindication of Iowa against the attacks of Missouri, and

illustrates how professedly strict Lutherans agree. We may recur to the subject and this publication in another number.

*Memorabilia concerning the Rev. Lucas Rauss*, one of the Early Ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America: including an account of his Ancestors and Descendants. By the Rev. Luther A Gotwald, D. D., Pastor of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church of York, Penn'a. O. Stuck printer, York, Pa. pp. 68. 1878.

This is a valuable contribution, not only as a memoir, but to the early history of the Lutheran Church in this country. Such memorabilia of all our earlier ministers would help greatly to furnish and preserve a knowledge of the planting of the Lutheran Church in America. Dr. Gotwald has performed a service that will be appreciated not only by the descendants of Rev. Lucas Rauss, but by the Church at large.

*Localities of the Reformation*, by G. D. Bernheim, D. D. Wilmington, N. C. A Lecture. pp. 23. 1877.

This Lecture furnishes very interesting notices of some of the prominent localities in the life of Luther as seen by the author. Of course a single lecture can present only a small part of all that might be said.

#### PERIODICALS.

The *North American Review* for nearly two-thirds of a century has been the acknowledged leader among the Reviews in the United States. The numbers 260, 261 of this year bespeak its venerable age, but it gives evidence of renewing its youth. Long the pride of Boston, and of New England culture, it has changed the locality of its publication, and now hails from New York—D. APPLETON & Co. publishers. The fact that the first two numbers, now a bi-monthly, have reached a second edition, shows its renewed popularity. Under the new regime it must hold the leading place which it so long occupied. The articles in the January-February, and March-April numbers are by distinguished writers and embrace a wide range of subjects. Among the noticeable articles are Charles Sumner, by Senator Hoar, General Amnesty, by J. Randolph Tucker, Ephesus, Cyprus and Mycenæ, by Bayard Taylor, Capture of Kars, and Fall of Plevna, by General G. B. McClellan, English and American Universities compared, by Chas. W. Eliot, LL. D., Stone Wall Jackson and the Valley Campaign, by Gen. Richard Taylor, The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment, by six divines of different Churches and views. Contemporary literature is duly noticed. It is published at \$5.00 a year, or \$1.00 a single number.

The *Foreign Quarterly* and *Blackwood, Harper, and Littell*, continue to come freighted with their rich and varied contents.

## CONTENTS OF NO. II.

Article.	Page.
I. A QUESTION TOUCHING THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION,	161
II. NEUROLOGY AND THE HUMAN SOUL,.....	177
By Prof. W. H. WYNN, Ph. D., State Agricultural College, Ames, Ia.	
III. A STUDY OF FRANCIS XAVIER,.....	199
By Rev. Prof. W. E. PARSON, A. M., of the Imperial University of Tokio, Japan.	
IV. GUARANTEES TO FAITH,.....	218
By Prof. S. A. REPASS, D. D., Salem, Va.	
V. WHAT IS THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TOWARD HER DELINQUENT MEMBERS,.....	229
Rev. A. W. LILLY, A. M., York, Pa.	
VI. ADAM,.....	244
* Translated from the German of Dean Buchrucker, of Munich, by Rev. G. F. BEHRINGER, Indianapolis, Ind.	
VII. THE SCRIBES BEFORE AND IN THE TIME OF CHRIST,	249
By Rev. B. PICK, Rochester, N. Y.	
VIII. THE HIGHER EDUCATION WITHOUT GOD,.....	278
By C. A. STORK, D. D., Baltimore, Md.	

## IX. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,..... 296

AMERICAN.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—  
Historical and Biographical—Miscellaneous.

BRITISH.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—  
Historical—Miscellaneous.

GERMAN.—Biblical—Historical.

## X. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,..... 298

The Encyclopædia Britannica—The Epoch of the Mammoth, and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth—Foreign Classics for English Readers—The Natural History of Atheism—Life and Times of Thomas Becket—All Saints' Day and other Sermons—Epochs of Modern History—Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs and Temples—Popular Astronomy—The Khedive's Egypt, or the Old House of Bondage under New Masters—History of the English People—Daniel, The Beloved—Our Children's Songs—Lost Forever—The Supernatural Factor in Religious Revivals—The Historical Student's Manual—The Telephone—Between the Gates—The Ancient Life—History of the Earth—Democracy in Europe—On the Study of Words—A History of Latin Literature—Boston Monday Lectures—Iowa and Missouri—Memorabilia of Rev. Lucas Rauss—Localities of the Reformation.

---

The following books arrived too late for notice in this number :

From J. B. Lippincott & Co., "The Last Times," by Dr. Seiss.

From the American Tract Society (Phila.), "Life and Death Eternal," By Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D.; "All for Christ : " A Sketch of the Life and Labors of the Rev. Charles H. Payson. Edited by his brother; "The Old Bible and the New Science," By J. B. Thomas, D. D.; "Plain Progressive Talks upon the Way of Salvation." By Rev. David R. Breed.